DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 443 199 EA 030 533

AUTHOR	Anderson, Leslie M.; Welsh, Megan
TITLE	Making Progress: An Update on State Implementation of Federal Education Laws Enacted in 1994.
INSTITUTION	Department of Education, Washington, DC. Planning and Evaluation Service.; Policy Studies Associates, Inc., Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC. Office of the Under Secretary.
PUB DATE	2000-06-00
NOTE	226p.; "With the assistance of Elizabeth A. Stief."
CONTRACT	EA94053001
AVAILABLE FROM	ED Pubs, P.O. Box 1398, Jessup, MD 20794-1398; Tel: 877-433-7827 (Toll-free). For full text: http://www.ed.gov/offices/OUS/eval/elem.html.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC10 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Accountability; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Aid; *Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Government Publications; *Local Legislation; Performance Based Assessment; Public Schools; Standards; *State Boards of Education; *State Government

ABSTRACT

This study focuses on the work of state administrators of federal programs. It follows up on baseline information collected during late fall 1996 and early winter 1997, analyzing the ways in which state administrators have continued to respond to the new laws. The programs included in the follow-up study are as follows: the Goals 2000: Educate America Act; Title I-A: Improving Basic Programs Implemented by Local Educational Agencies; Title I-B: Even Start Family Literacy; Title I-C: Education of Migratory Children; Title I-D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, and At-Risk of Dropping Out; Title II: Eisenhower Professional Development Program; Title III, Subpart 2: Technology Literacy Challenge Fund; Title IV: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities; and Title VI: Innovative Education Program Strategies. The study focuses on changes in program administration 4 years after the 1994 enactment of Goals 2000 and ESEA. Specifically, the study asks how state program managers are implementing the laws' provisions, how implementation has changed when compared with state practices under the predecessor programs, and what federal and state factors have influenced these changes. An appendix of survey instruments and a list of tables are provided. (DFR)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

EA

PES

PLANNING AND EVALUATION SERVICE

ED 443 199

MAKING PROGRESS:

AN UPDATE ON STATE IMPLEMENTATION OF FEDERAL EDUCATION LAWS ENACTED IN 1994

2000

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION   OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY

EA 030533

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This report was prepared for the U. S. Department of Education under Contract No. EA94053001. The views expressed herein are those of the contractor. No official endorsement by the U. S. Department of Education is intended or should be inferred.

U. S. Department of Education
Richard W. Riley
Secretary

Office of the Under Secretary
Judith A. Winston
Under Secretary (A)

Planning and Evaluation Service
Alan L. Ginsburg
Director

Elementary and Secondary Education Division
Ricky T. Takai
Director

June 2000

This report is in the public domain. Authorization to reproduce it in whole or in part is granted. While permission to reprint this publication is not necessary, the citation should be: U. S. Department of Education, Office of the Under Secretary, Planning and Evaluation Service, *Making Progress: An Update on State Implementation of Federal Education Laws Enacted in 1994*.

To order copies of this report, write:

ED Pubs
Editorial Publications Center
U. S. Department of Education
P. O. Box 1398
Jessup, MD 20794-1398;

via fax, dial (301) 470-1244;

or via electronic mail, send your request to:
edpubs@inet.ed.gov.

You may also call toll-free: 1-877-433-7827 (1-877-4-ED-PUBS). If 877 service is not yet available in your area, call 1-800-872-5327 (1-800-USA-LEARN). Those who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) or a teletypewriter (TTY), should call 1-800-437-0833.

To order online, point your Internet browser to: www.ed.gov/pubs/edpubs.html.

This report is also available on the Department's Web site at: www.ed.gov/offices/OUS/eval/elem.html.

On request, this publication is available in alternative formats, such as Braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette. For more information, please contact the Department's Alternate Format Center (202) 260-9895 or (202) 205-8113.

Making Progress:

An Update on State Implementation of Federal Education Laws Enacted in 1994

Leslie M. Anderson
Megan Welsh

With the assistance of:

Elizabeth A. Stief

2000

Policy Studies Associates
Washington, D.C.
Prepared for the U.S. Department of Education
Under ED Contract EA94053001

Contents

Page

List of Tables iv

Executive Summary ix

I. Introduction 1

  Findings from the Baseline Study 2
  Design Changes in the Follow-up Study 3
  The Nine Federal Programs Studied 3
  Study Purposes and Research Questions 6
  Study Methods 7
  Survey Respondents 7

II. Flexibility: Do States and Districts Continue to Experience New Latitude in in Implementing the Law? 9

  States' Administrative Flexibility 9
  State-Level Program Coordination 15
  Local Administrative Flexibility 30
  Summary: The Status of "Flexibility" 38

III. Accountability: To What Extent Are States Implementing Standards-Based Accountability Systems? 41

  Content Standards: How Are They Affecting State Administration of Federally Funded Programs? 41
  Uses of Data in SEA Program Management 47
  State Monitoring 56
  Federal Monitoring 66
  Summary: Accountability Mechanisms in Place 69

IV. Technical Assistance: Are States Working Strategically to Build Local Capacity in Support of Standards-Based Reform? 71

  State Technical Assistance 71
  Federal Technical Assistance 84
  Summary: Positive Steps, But Insufficient Capacity 87

V. Performance Indicators: Are States Collecting and Using Indicators Data to Inform Program Performance? 89

  State-Developed Program Performance Indicators 89
  Federal Program Performance Indicators 92
  Summary: Program Performance Indicators Arrive 123

VI. Conclusions 125

Bibliography 127

Appendix: Survey Instruments

Tables

Page

Table 1. Extent to Which State Administrators Find the Reauthorized Legislation Gives Them More Administrative Flexibility Than They Had Before the Reauthorization, by Program 11

Table 2. State Administrators Who Report Conducting Administrative or Operational Activities in Coordination with Other Federally Funded Education Programs, by Program 17

Table 3. Types of Administrative or Operational Activities State Administrators Report Conducting in Coordination with Other Federally Funded Education Programs, by Program 18

Table 4. Extent to Which Consolidation of Administrative Funding Affects the Way Administrators Do Their Job, by Program 26

Table 5. State Administrators Reporting That Consolidating Administrative Funds Has Increased Their Program's Capacity to Do Things, by Program 28

Table 6. Policy on Consolidated District Applications, by Program 31

Table 7a. State Administrators Reporting on How Well Local Consolidated Plans or Applications Provide Them with Information about Their Programs, by Program 34

Table 7b. State Administrators Reporting on How Well Local Consolidated Plans or Applications Provide Them with Information about Their Programs, by Program 35

Table 8. State Administrators Reporting on the Strengths and Weaknesses of Local Implementation of Consolidated Plans, by Program 36

Table 9. State Administrators Who Report the Following Problems with the Implementation of Standards-based Reform, by Program 43

Table 10. State Administrators Who Choose Content or Performance Standards as a Focus for Capacity Building, by Program 45

Table 11. Student Performance Information that Local School Districts, Schools, and Subgrantees are Required to Report to the State Regarding Program Participants, by Program 49

Table 12. Purposes for Which Program Offices Use Student Performance Data, by Program 50

Table 13. Program Implementation Information that Local School Districts, Schools, and Subgrantees are Required to Report to the State Regarding their Federally Funded Program, by Program 52

Tables (continued)

Page

Table 14. Purposes for Which Program Offices Use Program Implementation Data, by Program 54

Table 15. Program Effects Resulting from the Availability of Program and Student Performance Data, by Program 55

Table 16. State Administrators Reporting that their Program Makes Decisions or Provides Services Based on State-Level Data Identifying Failing Schools, by Program 57

Table 17. Priorities State Administrators Report Addressing through Monitoring, by Program 58

Table 18. Project Monitoring: Proportion of Program Subgrantees Receiving Monitoring Visits in the Past 12 Months, by Program 60

Table 19. Project Monitoring: Reasons Why State Administrators Visit Subgrantees, by Program 62

Table 20. State Administrators Reporting that their State Conducts Integrated Monitoring Visits, by Program 64

Table 21. State Administrators Reporting on the Strengths and Weaknesses of the Integrated Monitoring Process, by Program 65

Table 22. State Administrators who Believe the U.S. Department of Education's Regional Service Team Visits are a Useful Strategy for Implementing Federally Funded Programs to Support Comprehensive Standards-based Reform, by Program 68

Table 23. State Education Agency Downsizing or Reorganization, by Program 72

Table 24. Extent to which Programs were Able to Meet their Subgrantees' Technical Assistance Needs in the Past 12 Months, by Program 73

Table 25. Program Priorities for Allocating Technical Assistance Resources, by Program 75

Table 26. Technical Assistance Topics States Fund or Directly Provide to Subgrantees, by Program 77

Table 27. Factors that Most Influenced State Administrators' Selection of Technical Assistance Topics that their Program Funded or Directly Provided to Subgrantees, by Program 78

Table 28. Number of State Administrators who Encouraged Subgrantees to Pool their Program Funds for Professional Development with those of any Other Federal or State Program, by Program 80

Tables (continued)

Page

Table 29. Using Federal Education Program Funds to Support State Reform Goals, by Program 83

Table 30. State Administrators Who Find Various Organizations and Agencies to be Helpful in Informing Their Understanding of Federal Legislative Provisions Affecting Their Program, by Program 85

Table 31. Timeliness with Which State Administrators Received Information from the U.S. Department of Education Regarding the Federal Legislative Provisions Affecting their Program, by Program 86

Table 32. Sources of Guidance that State Administrators Report are the Most Influential Regarding Decisions about Program Administration, by Program 88

Table 33. State Administrators Reporting that Their Program has Developed Performance Indicators, by Program 90

Table 34. State Administrators Reporting on How They Use Their Program Performance Indicators, by Program 91

Table 35. State Administrators Reporting that They are Aware of the U.S. Department of Education's Program Performance Indicators, by Program 93

Table 36. State Administrators Reporting that They Collect Program Performance Indicator Data, by Program 94

Table 37. Ways in Which States Initiate Corrective Action Against Local School Districts that Fail to Submit Data to the State on the Indicators for Which Data Have been Requested or Required 96

Table 38. Ways in Which States Use Federal Program Performance Indicator Data 97

Table 39. Extent to Which Title I Program Administrators Collect Data on Federal Program Performance Indicators 99

Table 40. Title I Program Administrators' Use of Federal Program Performance Indicator Data 100

Table 41. Extent to Which Even Start Program Administrators Collect Data on Performance Indicators 102

Table 42. Even Start Program Administrators' Use of Federal Program Performance Indicator Data 103

Tables (continued)

Page

Table 43. Extent to Which Migrant Education Program Administrators Collect Data on Federal Program Performance Indicators 105

Table 44. Migrant Program Administrators' Use of Federal Program Performance Indicator Data 106

Table 45. Extent to Which Administrators for the Neglected or Delinquent Program Collect Data on Federal Program Performance Indicators 107

Table 46. Neglected or Delinquent Program Administrators' Use of Federal Program Performance Indicator Data 109

Table 47. Extent to Which Administrators of the Eisenhower Professional Development Program Collect Data on Federal Program Performance Indicators 110

Table 48. Eisenhower Professional Development Program Administrators' Use of Federal Program Performance Indicator Data 112

Table 49. Degree of Difficulty Eisenhower Professional Development Program Administrators Predict in Collecting Federal Program Performance Indicator Data 113

Table 50. Extent to Which TLCF Program Administrators Collect Data on Federal Program Performance Indicators 114

Table 51. TLCF Program Administrators' Use of Federal Program Performance Indicator Data 116

Table 52. Extent to Which Administrators for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Program Collect Data on Federal Program Performance Indicators 117

Table 53. Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Program Administrators' Use of Federal Program Performance Indicator Data 118

Table 54. Extent to Which Title VI Program Administrators Collect Data on Federal Program Performance Indicators 120

Table 55. Title VI Program Administrators' Use of Federal Program Performance Indicator Data 121

Table 56. Extent to Which Goals 2000 Program Administrators Collect Data on Federal Program Performance Indicators 122

Table 57. Goals 2000 Program Administrators' Use of Federal Program Performance Indicator Data 124

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Study Purposes and Design

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act and the Improving America's Schools Act (IASA), which amended the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), were enacted in 1994. Together they were designed to provide a comprehensive system of support for state and local education reform initiatives that would enhance children's educational achievement. Specifically, the laws allowed state administrators of federal programs to coordinate and consolidate their administrative functions so as to minimize the burden and cost and thereby redirect their programs to support broader state policy initiatives, such as the implementation of standards. These laws also offered greater decision-making authority and flexibility to local administrators and teachers in exchange for greater responsibility for student performance.

This study, conducted under contract with the Planning and Evaluation Service in the Office of the Under Secretary, U.S. Department of Education (ED), focuses on the work of state administrators of federal programs. It follows up on baseline information collected during late fall 1996 and early winter 1997, analyzing the ways in which state administrators have continued to respond to the new laws. Data for the follow-up study were collected in summer and fall 1998. The programs included in the follow-up study are: the Goals 2000: Educate America Act; Title I-A: Improving Basic Programs Implemented by Local Educational Agencies; Title I-B: Even Start Family Literacy; Title I-C: Education of Migratory Children; Title I-D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk of Dropping Out; Title II: Eisenhower Professional Development Program; Title III, Subpart 2: Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (TLCF); Title IV: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities; and Title VI: Innovative Education Program Strategies.

- This study focuses on changes in program administration four years after the 1994 enactment of Goals 2000 and ESEA. Specifically, the study asks: (1) how state program managers are implementing the laws' provisions; (2) how implementation has changed when compared with state practices under the predecessor programs; and (3) what federal and state factors have influenced these changes. The study explores the extent to which managers administered federal programs in ways that: (1) make use of increased flexibility across programs; (2) make programs more accountable for student performance; and (3) support improvements in teaching and learning.

- The follow-up study differs from the baseline study in that it: (1) did not include the Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program because that program is being evaluated under a separate ED-funded study; (2) included site visits to eight rather than 13 states and interviews with program administrators at both the state and district levels (two districts per state); (3) had a special focus on the implementation of the Education

Flexibility Partnership Demonstration Program (Ed-Flex); (4) included Title III, the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund; and (5) looked at the extent to which states are collecting data that would inform the program performance indicators developed by ED under the Government Performance and Results Act.

- Surveys were administered during late summer and fall 1998 (approximately four years after the reauthorization of ESEA, four-and-a-half years after the authorization of Goals 2000, and two years after the baseline study data were collected) in all 51 state education agencies (including the District of Columbia) to state-level managers of each of nine federal programs, plus administrators knowledgeable about Ed-Flex, for a total of 468 possible respondents. Each follow-up survey was administered by telephone as a personal interview with standard questions. Out of a possible 468 surveys, 447 were completed, a response rate of 96 percent.

Flexibility: Do States and Districts Continue to Experience New Latitude in Implementing the Law?

Two-thirds of state administrators of ESEA programs surveyed in 1998 believed that their own flexibility had increased in the four years after reauthorization, whereas in 1996-97, Title I was the only program in which a majority of administrators reported an increase in administrative flexibility. When asked whether they need additional flexibility, most administrators reported that the legislation provided them with sufficient flexibility.

This study looked at the ways in which state program administrators have continued to make use of the flexibility provisions in the new laws and the extent to which they have moved beyond attention to procedural provisions—such as consolidated planning and cross-program communication—and begun focusing on the task of using the flexibility provisions to align program services and operations to support state content and performance standards and thereby improve student achievement.

- In describing the administrative flexibility available to them since reauthorization, state program managers expressed two major themes: (1) the opportunity to coordinate and collaborate with other federally funded programs, and (2) the opportunity to support local reform plans. The first theme was also prominent in responses collected during the baseline study; the second, however, grew in frequency, suggesting that state administrators may have moved further along in their thinking about the ultimate purpose of their programs: to support local reform efforts. Indeed, many program managers described efforts to help districts find ways—sometimes creative ones—to use federal program resources to meet local needs rather than using administrative flexibility to simply administer programs within an explicit framework of program regulations and requirements. Few administrators, however, mentioned the relationship between flexibility and improvements in program services or student outcomes.

- Some program administrators explained that although they may have the flexibility they need from the federal level to successfully administer their programs, state-level policies and practices can curtail the flexibility that the reauthorized ESEA affords them.
- Several program managers expressed frustration at not being afforded the same flexibility in responding to federal reporting requirements that they enjoy with respect to program planning and funds consolidation; some argued that ED's program-specific reporting requirements work to dissuade program managers from coordinating program services and activities as well as causing states to impose undue reporting burdens on districts.

State-Level Program Coordination

In 1996-97, we learned that almost all state administrators of the programs included in the follow-up study participated in the development of their state's consolidated plan. What we did not know was to what extent consolidated planning was translating into coordinated program administration and operations. Moreover, we did not know whether and to what extent administrators were organizing program administration and operations around supporting state goals or whether consolidating administrative funds was translating into increased administrative and operational capacity among programs.

- Most state administrators (81 percent) reported conducting specific administrative or operational activities in coordination with other federally funded education programs, including: (1) providing technical assistance to districts and schools; (2) holding local application and planning workshops; (3) monitoring local projects; and (4) making decisions with respect to allocating program resources to districts and schools. Despite these efforts, state administrators have only just begun coordinating certain administrative and operational activities, and only with a core group of programs (typically, Titles I, VI, Eisenhower Professional Development, and Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities).
- Roughly one-fourth of the administrators for the smaller programs—Migrant Education, Even Start, and Neglected or Delinquent—said that they were not coordinating any administrative or operational activities with other federally funded education programs. Many managers of the formula-based programs explained that the timelines and deadlines for applications for most discretionary grants programs simply do not match those for formula-based programs, making coordination difficult.

Consolidated administrative funding. The IASA law allowed states to make a change in the way they accounted for state-level program administration funds: it authorized them to consolidate into a single pool the administrative set-asides under Title I, Even Start, Migrant Education, Neglected or Delinquent, Eisenhower Professional Development, TLCF, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and

Communities, Title VI, and Goals 2000. The notion behind this additional flexibility was that it would "make it easier [for state administrators] to plan across programs" (U.S. Department of Education, 1996a; p. 7).

- Fewer states (18 in 1998 compared to 28 in 1996-97) reported that they consolidated administrative funds. The decline in the number of states consolidating funds may be explained, in part, by the significant turnover many SEAs experienced in the past few years; consequently, some program managers are fairly new to their positions and may simply not know whether their program's administrative funds are part of a consolidation.

- Looking at all the state administrators across all states who said their agency had consolidated administrative funds, 69 percent reported some effect on their own work, with no significant variation by program. The tone of most comments from state administrators in 1998 regarding the effects of funds consolidation, however, was decidedly negative. Some complained that consolidation had resulted in their having less money to administer their programs and to award to subgrantees. Other administrators complained that they had lost control of their program resources as a result of consolidation.

State participation in the Education Flexibility Partnership Demonstration Program or "Ed-Flex." Established by the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, Ed-Flex gives participating states the "power to waive requirements of certain federal education programs, including Title I and the Eisenhower Professional Development Programs" in exchange for increased accountability for results (Ed-Flex Fact Sheet, ED, 1996).

- Among the 12 states that received Ed-Flex authority, administrators reported that the local waiver provision was, at best, underused and at worst, ignored. Of the 10 administrators who were able to estimate the number of districts in their states that had received waivers, seven said the number was 20 or fewer. The most common explanation administrators offered for underuse of the waiver authority was that the reauthorized legislation grants programs sufficient flexibility, thereby rendering Ed-Flex superfluous; as one administrator pointed out: "There is so much flexibility built into ESEA that there is not a big need for more."

- Most administrators in the 12 states that received Ed-Flex authority reported including student performance among their criteria for assessing the impact of waivers and said they will revoke district waivers as a result of poor student performance—although none had, as yet, done so.

- Despite their rather limited use among districts, few state administrators would be willing to discard waivers as meaningless: most (8) say they believe—to some or to a great extent—that the Ed-Flex waiver authority (1) furthers state reform efforts, and (2) improves the coordination of federal resources with state reform efforts.

Local Administrative Flexibility

The Goals 2000 and IASA amendments aimed to increase flexibility in schools and school districts so that administrative requirements would not impede progress in helping all students meet high standards. The survey asked state administrators to report on the extent to which the administrative flexibility afforded state education agencies was being extended to the local level.

- About 57 percent of all program administrators reported that they required or accepted consolidated applications from districts. Although this shows a slight decrease from 1996-97 (i.e., 60 percent of program administrators required or accepted consolidated applications), follow-up survey data showed an increase in the percentage of administrators who reported requiring—versus merely accepting—consolidated local plans or applications (30 percent in 1998 versus 22 percent in 1996-97.

- State administrators of discretionary grants programs more frequently reported requiring *separate* subgrant applications than did administrators of formula grants programs. Administrators who continue to require separate local applications explain that discretionary grants programs operate on different grant cycles from the formula-based programs.

- Interviews in 1998 with local administrators suggest that states were not making it easy for districts to submit consolidated plans. According to local administrators, state managers do not know what a local consolidated plan ought to look like—nor how they can support local program coordination—and therefore are unable to offer districts much assistance.

Accountability: To What Extent Are States Implementing Standards-Based Accountability Systems?

The follow-up survey explored the extent to which, four years after reauthorization, state administrators were organizing their work around aligning program services and operations with state content and student performance standards in an effort to improve student achievement. In addition, it explored the extent to which state administrators were using a variety of accountability tools—including student performance data, program implementation data, and program monitoring systems—to press vigorously for improved student performance.

Content Standards: How Are They Affecting State Administration of Federally Funded Programs?

Four years after implementing the law, it appears that state program administrators have come to recognize that supporting standards-based reform is part of their programs' purpose. Moreover, many administrators in their responses to open-ended survey questions mentioned raising student achievement—the ultimate goal of standards-based reform—as among their more fundamental program goals.

- Few respondents (6 percent) said that standards are "not relevant" to the services their program provides or that the program staff do not have the time (14 percent) or the expertise (4 percent) "to communicate a new program purpose driven by state standards."

- By coordinating technical assistance, monitoring, and other administrative tasks—and thereby reducing their administrative burdens—some managers believe they have more time to focus on the complicated issue of improving student achievement. Nevertheless, a lack of adequate staff was commonly cited as the reason why programs could not focus more on student achievement. Indeed, administrators expressed intense frustration about their limited capacity to fulfill administrative tasks, let alone to go beyond minimal federal requirements.

- Regarding the implementation of state standards and assessments, several program managers explained that they had not paid particular attention to student achievement in the past simply because it did not make sense in the absence of state standards and assessment systems: what, they asked, would they be measuring in order to assess student achievement against?

- Although state administrators said more in 1998 about their efforts to focus program operations and activities on raising student achievement, they still expressed reluctance to link program success to student achievement. With the exception of most Title I administrators, state administrators argued that federal program reporting requirements create a disincentive for linking program success to student achievement by continuing to focus on process and inputs, rather than on outcomes such as improving student performance.

Uses of Data in SEA Program Management

As was true in 1996-97, it appeared that the goal of instilling a culture of accountability and continual improvement among those administering federally funded programs was unmet. While administrators were seemingly collecting or already have at their disposal a great deal of student performance and program implementation data, they were not using the data—or, at least, their purposes in using the data had little to do with judging the success of federally funded programs in raising student achievement.

Student performance data.

- Forty-two percent of all state administrators do not require subgrantees to report to the state regarding the performance of students participating in their programs. This phenomenon was most common among programs that do not provide direct services to students (Eisenhower Professional Development, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, Title VI, and the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund). However, substantial numbers of administrators of Migrant Education, Even Start, and Neglected or Delinquent programs also said they do not require their subgrantees to submit student performance data.

- The types of student performance data that administrators most frequently said they required from subgrantees suggest that increased attention to student achievement among federal program administrators may be beginning to take hold: of the 250 administrators who require districts to submit student performance data, 53 percent said they collect data on student performance results from the state assessment; and 42 percent said they collect performance results from tests other than the state's assessment.

- While administrators may be collecting student performance data, follow-up survey data also show that the number of state administrators who report using the data for any purpose has declined since 1996-97: 23 percent acknowledged that they did not use the data for any purpose, compared to 15 percent in 1996-97. This was most common among administrators of Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities and Migrant Education programs.

Program implementation data.

- Far more state administrators (95 percent) require subgrantees to report program implementation than student performance data. The types of program implementation data that administrators most frequently said they required from subgrantees were: (1) summaries of services rendered; (2) indicators of collaboration with other programs; and (3) evidence of varied demographic and ethnic group participation . Most administrators said they use program implementation data for (1) reporting to the federal government and (2) identifying program services that need to be extended or reduced.

- With the exception of the Title I and Goals 2000 programs, just under half of the state administrators (44 percent) reported that program implementation and student performance data helped focus program staff on student results and achievement. By comparison, 84 percent of Title I administrators and 63 percent of Goals 2000 administrators reported that the availability of program and student performance data helped focus program staff on student results and achievement.

State Monitoring

Despite progress since the baseline study, states still had far to go in building new monitoring procedures that would communicate a clear message about a new standards-based accountability framework.

- With downsizing of state administrative staffs, monitoring visits continued to be infrequent: 1998 survey data showed that more and more programs are visiting fewer and fewer subgrantees in a 12-month period.

- As was true in 1996-97, rather than focusing their relatively infrequent monitoring activities on districts that might be out of compliance or where student performance was low, state program managers most frequently reported using a routine cycle for monitoring visits (61 percent). However, 1998 survey data also showed that managers' targeting methods may be starting to change: more administrators said they are using information about compliance problems (45 percent versus 36 percent in the earlier survey) or student performance (21 percent versus 13 percent) to decide which subgrantees to visit, with no particular variation by program.

- Integrated monitoring visits continue to be the trend among federally funded programs; about 38 states (up from 27 in 1996-97) conducted some form of integrated monitoring visits. However, programs participating in integrated monitoring visits were generally visiting fewer subgrantees than were those conducting program-specific monitoring visits.

Federal Monitoring

Early into the reauthorization period of ESEA, the U.S. Department of Education (ED) began to retool its program monitoring system in an effort to better support state and local education reform activities: ED established 10 Regional Service Teams (RSTs) charged with the responsibility of monitoring and providing technical assistance to state and local education agencies for programs authorized and administered out of the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. As of late 1998 (when survey data were collected), all but four states had been visited by a federal Integrated Review Team (IRT).

- Among those administrators whose states had been visited by an IRT, many believed the visits were "somewhat" useful (37 percent); fewer respondents considered the visits to be "very useful" (18 percent), or "useful" (18 percent), and 19 percent said they believed that the visits were "not useful." Twice as many administrators of Eisenhower Professional Development, Title I, Goals 2000, TLCF, and Title VI programs viewed the IRT visits as "very useful" than did administrators of other programs.

Technical Assistance: Are States Working Strategically to Build Local Capacity in Support of Standards-Based reform?

States appeared to make progress in the area of technical assistance. In 1998, program administrators showed greater coordination in the content of the technical assistance they provided than in 1996-97, and much of that content focused on a standards-based reform agenda. However, as was true in 1996-97, agency downsizing in many SEAs continued adversely to affect the technical assistance capacity in federal programs, and interviews with local program administrators indicated that states were not meeting their subgrantees' technical assistance needs.

- With limited resources, state program administrators continued to make difficult choices about where to provide assistance. When asked about technical assistance needs that have gone—to a greater or lesser extent—unmet, state administrators most often said they are unable to get to every district that needs or requests help or that they are unable to provide sustained assistance or follow-up.
- Increasing numbers of state administrators (81 percent, up from 72 percent in 1996-97) were relying on districts to know when they need help and how to ask for it, rather than actively assessing local need for assistance in implementing their programs.
- In site visits to 16 districts in eight states, our interviews with local program administrators generally confirmed state managers' worst fears: states are not meeting their subgrantees' technical needs. Most local administrators refer to the tremendous turnover their SEAs have experienced in the past several years and mourn the loss of institutional knowledge; some feel they are having to spend time training their state administrators to do their jobs.

Performance Indicators: Are States Collecting and Using Indicators Data to Inform Program Performance?

Findings from the baseline study showed that program performance indicators were not a particularly common means by which program administrators assessed and improved program success. Since that study was conducted, the U.S. Department of Education has developed—as mandated under the Government Performance and Results Act—a set of program performance indicators intended to inform Congress, the Department, and the nation about the effectiveness of federal elementary and secondary programs.

State-Developed Program Performance Indicators

Program performance indicators appear to be on the rise among federally funded programs. In 1998, 55 percent of state administrators reported that their program either had developed (26 percent) or was in the process of developing (29 percent) performance indicators; in 1996-97, the overall percentage was just 41 percent.

- Performance indicators were found in significant majorities in state offices administering Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (85 percent) and Eisenhower Professional Development (84 percent) programs.

- Among the 26 percent of state administrators who reported having already developed—as opposed to being in the process of developing—performance indicators, most reported that they were using the indicators to inform their work and to facilitate cross-program coordination and planning.

Federal Program Performance Indicators

In 1998, state administrators were asked whether they: (1) were aware of the program performance indicators developed by the U.S. Department of Education and (2) collected and used the federal performance indicator data.

- About 62 percent of all state administrators reported being aware of the fact that the U.S. Department of Education had developed a set of performance indicators for their respective programs. Administrators of Eisenhower Professional Development, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, and the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund were well above average in terms of knowing about the existence of the federal program performance indicators.

- Of the 267 program administrators who were aware of the federal program performance indicators, 217 or 81 percent also collected some or all data on them. Administrators of Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities and the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund reported both being aware of and collecting these data more than any other program (100 percent and 92 percent of administrators collected data, respectively).

- Of the 217 program administrators who collect some or all data related to the federal program performance indicators, most administrators reported using the data to report to federal officials (81 percent).

Conclusions

This study found that in 1998—four years after reauthorization of ESEA and four-and-a-half years after the authorization of Goals 2000—states had made significant progress in implementing the legislation in a number of areas.

- The vast majority of state administrators in 1998 perceived flexibility in the legislation, and many reported using that flexibility to help districts find ways to use federal program resources to meet local needs.

- In 1998, administrators were more likely to recognize linkages between program purposes and student achievement and to acknowledge that supporting standards-based reform is part of their programs' purpose. These changes seemed due largely to efforts to coordinate program administration and operations across federal programs and the long-awaited implementation of state standards and assessment systems.

- Despite progress since the baseline study, states still had far to go in building new monitoring procedures that would communicate a clear message about a new, standards-based accountability framework. In addition, although administrators seemed to have access to a great deal of data about student performance and program implementation, they were most often using the data for purposes other than judging the success of their programs in raising student achievement.

A great deal of organizational learning was called for in order to respond to the challenges presented by the new and reauthorized laws placed before the SEAs in 1994. The baseline and follow-up studies point to progress not only in initiating new administrative routines but also in developing a new outlook on program purposes and priorities. Although state administrators were not uniformly adhering to an agenda of standards-based, data-driven reform in 1998, these studies provide evidence that they had moved in that direction in some respects and might be more strongly encouraged and helped to do so in other respects.

I. Introduction

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act and the Improving America's Schools Act (IASA), which amended the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), were enacted in 1994. Together they were designed to provide a comprehensive system of support for state and local education reform initiatives that would enhance children's educational achievement. This federal legislation promoted the use of federal funds to support systemic, standards-based approaches to improving the quality of teaching and learning. Specifically, these federally supported elementary and secondary education programs set an ambitious agenda of policy changes, including supporting states in the development of:

- Challenging state standards of curriculum content and student performance.
- High-quality student assessment (and accountability) systems that are aligned with challenging state content and student performance standards.
- Sustained, intensive professional development aligned with challenging state standards.

Goals 2000 and the programs reauthorized under IASA also promoted a more coordinated, coherent approach to program administration; the barriers between categorical programs were reduced. The laws allowed state administrators of federal programs to coordinate and consolidate their administrative functions so as to minimize the burden and cost and thereby redirect their programs to support broader state policy initiatives, such as the implementation of standards. These laws also offered greater decision-making authority and flexibility to local administrators and teachers in exchange for greater responsibility for student performance.

State education agencies (SEAs) play a crucial role in implementing the new laws: they are a primary source of information and guidance for local school districts; and the states have the lead role in setting academic standards and deciding how to assess student progress. Goals 2000 and the reauthorized ESEA encouraged state administrators of federal programs to use new approaches in program management—to communicate a more concerted focus on improving students' chances of meeting high standards, and to pull administrative operations together across categorical programs. This study, conducted under contract with the Planning and Evaluation Service in the Office of the Under Secretary, U.S. Department of Education (ED), focuses on the work of these key administrators at the state level. It follows up on baseline information collected during late fall 1996 and early winter 1997, analyzing the ways in which state administrators of federally funded programs have continued to respond to the new legislative framework. Data for the follow-up study were collected in summer and fall 1998.

Findings from the Baseline Study

In the first two years of implementation of Goals 2000, the reauthorized ESEA programs, and the Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program, SEA administrators of these federal programs had taken major steps toward cross-program communication within their own agencies, and many program administrators had also communicated a message of broad program change to their local school districts. Effects were beginning to emerge, although they were not as large as some might wish. Where early implementation fell short of the original federal vision was in the depth and intensity of program administrators' work around standards-based educational improvement. (Findings presented in this section were collected in the 1996-97 survey; results of that survey are also summarized in Anderson and Turnbull [1998].)

- All SEAs made noticeable changes to their procedures in implementing the reauthorized programs. Consolidated plans were almost universal, and the planning process had helped inform administrators about each others' programs; in many cases, planning had also given them new ideas about ways to work together. This collaborative work was beginning to result in the acceptance, albeit often on a pilot basis, of consolidated plans from local school districts and integrated monitoring visits across programs.
- Most program administrators gave little evidence that they were attending to student performance. Having largely dismantled their old monitoring systems, few were sending a strong message to their districts that accountability for student performance would replace the compliance monitoring of the past.
- Compliance monitoring was being replaced with technical assistance—primarily offered to districts that knew when and how to ask for it.

In short, new procedures for program administration (such as consolidated state planning) were a force behind a good deal of change. The program administrators also reported that downsizing and other SEA reorganizations had prompted changes in program management. Largely missing from the understanding of most program administrators, however, was an urgency to organize their day-to-day work around aligning program services and operations with the expectations for students' academic performance embodied in state content and performance standards.

Design Changes in the Follow-up Study

While the study purposes and research questions remain largely the same, the follow-up study differs in some important respects from the baseline study of state implementation of federal elementary and secondary programs. First, because a national evaluation of the Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program is currently underway and includes telephone interviews with all the state coordinators of the Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program, that program was not included in the follow-up state implementation study. Second, the follow-up state implementation study included site visits to eight rather than 13 states, and included interviews with program administrators at both the state and district levels (two districts per state). Third, the follow-up study had a special focus on the implementation of the Education Flexibility Partnership Demonstration Program (Ed-Flex) among the 12 states that received Ed-Flex authority under the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. The follow-up study also investigated state-level operations and effects of Title III, the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund. Finally, the follow-up study gathered information on the extent to which states are collecting data that would inform the program performance indicators developed by ED under the Government Performance and Results Act. The data were collected in summer and fall 1998.

The Nine Federal Programs Studied

This study focuses on Goals 2000 and eight programs under the 1994 Improving America's Schools Act, which amended the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The programs vary in purpose, size, and funding arrangements, but each one has given the states a key role to play in communicating program purposes and procedures to local districts. The programs included in this study are (in order of size):[1]

- ***Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965: Helping Disadvantaged Children Meet High Standards; Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*** (amended in 1994). Supports local educational agencies in improving teaching and learning to help low-achieving students in high-poverty schools meet the same challenging state content and performance standards that apply to all students. Promotes effective instructional strategies that increase the amount and quality of learning time for at-risk children and that deliver an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Also expands eligibility of schools for schoolwide programs that serve all children in high-poverty schools; encourages school-based planning; establishes accountability based on results; promotes effective parental participation; and supports coordination with health and social services.

---

[1] The IASA program descriptions are taken from U.S. Department of Education, *Cross-Cutting Guidance for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (Washington: September 1996); the descriptions of Goals 2000 and Education for Homeless Children and Youth are taken from the statutes.

Type of Assistance: Formula grants
FY 1998 Appropriation: $7.5 billion

- ***Title IV, ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities.*** Supports Goal Seven of the National Education Goals by encouraging comprehensive approaches to make schools and neighborhoods safe and drug-free. Provides funds to governors, state education agencies (SEAs), local education agencies (LEAs), institutions of higher education, and nonprofit entities for a variety of drug and violence prevention programs.

  Type of Assistance: Formula grants to state education agencies and local education agencies; formula grants to governors who make discretionary awards
  FY 1998 Appropriation: $531 million

- ***Title III, Goals 2000: Educate America Act: State and Local Education Systemic Improvement.*** Seeks to "improve the quality of education for all students by improving student learning through a long-term, broad-based effort to promote coherent and coordinated improvements in the system of education throughout the nation at the state and local levels" (Sec. 302).

  Type of Assistance: Formula grants to states; discretionary grants to districts.
  FY 1998 Appropriation: $466 million

- ***Title III, Subpart 2, ESEA: Technology Literacy Challenge Fund.*** Provides resources to speed the implementation of statewide strategies designed to enable all schools to integrate technology fully into school curricula, so that all students become technologically literate with the reading, math, science, and other core academic skills essential for their success in the 21st Century.

  Type of Assistance: Formula grants to state education agencies; discretionary grants to districts
  FY 1998 Appropriation: $425 million

- ***Title VI, ESEA: Innovative Education Program Strategies.*** Provides broad support for activities that encourage school reform and educational innovation.

  Type of Assistance: Formula grants
  FY 1998 Appropriation: $350 million

- ***Title II, ESEA: Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development Program.*** Concentrates on upgrading the expertise of teachers and other school staff to enable them to teach all children to challenging state content standards. Supports sustained and intensive high-quality professional development, focused on achieving high performance standards in mathematics, science, and other core academic subjects.

Type of Assistance: Formula grants
FY 1998 Appropriation: $335 million

- ***Title I, ESEA, Part C: Education of Migratory Children.*** Supports educational programs for migratory children to help reduce the educational disruptions and other problems that result from repeated moves. Helps provide migratory children with the same opportunities as other children to meet challenging state content and performance standards. Targets efforts on the most mobile children, whose schooling is most likely to be disrupted.

  Type of Assistance: Formula grants
  FY 1998 Appropriation: $305 million

- ***Title I, ESEA, Part B: Even Start Family Literacy.*** Improves the educational opportunities of low-income families by integrating early childhood education, adult literacy or adult basic education, and parenting education into a unified family literacy program.

  Type of Assistance: Formula grants to state education agencies, which in turn make discretionary grants to partnerships of local education agencies and nonprofit community-based organizations or other nonprofit organizations; federal discretionary grants for projects that serve migratory children and their families, Indian tribes, tribal organizations, the outlying areas, and a project in a prison housing women and preschool-aged children; and to states for statewide family literacy initiatives.
  FY 1998 Appropriation: $124 million

- ***Title I, ESEA, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk of Dropping Out, Subpart 1.*** Extends educational services and learning time in state institutions and community-day programs for neglected and delinquent children and youth. Encourages smooth transitions to enable participants to continue schooling or enter the job market upon leaving the institution.

  Type of Assistance: Formula grants to state education agencies; discretionary grants to state agencies and local education agencies
  FY 1998 Appropriation: $39 million

Study Purposes and Research Questions

The evaluation's purposes were derived from ED's larger framework of data collection and analysis for the National Assessment of Title I (mandated in Sec. 1501 of the Improving America's Schools Act) and a comprehensive evaluation of federal support for elementary and secondary reform (Sec. 14701). In consultation with an Independent Review Panel of state and local educators, researchers, and other citizens, ED decided to focus on the following aspects of program implementation at the state and local levels: high academic standards for all children; assessment and evaluation; support for enriching curriculum and instruction; flexibility coupled with accountability for student performance; and targeting of resources.

Cutting across these topical areas of focus are this study's questions about administrative processes at the state level:

- How are state program managers currently implementing the law's provisions?
- How has implementation changed when compared with state practices under the predecessor programs?
- What federal and state factors underlie these changes?

This study, then, focused on changes in program administration after the 1994 reauthorization of federal programs under ESEA and the enactment of Goals 2000. It explored state-level progress in the years following the 1994 reauthorization toward administering the federal programs in ways that:

- Make use of increased flexibility across programs.
- Make programs more accountable for student performance.
- Support improvements in teaching and learning.

These elements of state program administration form the organizing structure for this report: each of the next three chapters presents findings related to one of the above elements; a fourth chapter discusses the development and use of state and federal program performance indicators as a specific approach to program assessment and improvement; and a concluding chapter discusses overall trends in state administration of federal programs.

Study Methods

Surveys were administered during late summer and fall 1998 (approximately four years after the reauthorization of ESEA, four-and-a-half years after the authorization of Goals 2000, and two years after the baseline study data were collected) in all 51 state education agencies (including the District of Columbia) to state-level managers of each of nine federal programs, plus administrators knowledgeable about the Education Flexibility Partnership Demonstration Program or "Ed-Flex" (henceforth referred to as "Ed-Flex administrators"), for a total of 468 possible respondents. As was true of the baseline study, respondents did not complete paper-and-pencil surveys. Instead, each follow-up survey was administered by telephone as a personal interview with standard questions, some of them closed-ended and some open-ended. The interviewers recorded all responses on written forms. Responses to closed-ended questions were tabulated; responses to open-ended questions were coded for tabulation as well as yielding more elaborated information.

To explore cross-cutting matters such as state procedures in planning or technical assistance under all nine programs, we again created a core survey to be administered to state-level managers of all the programs. By asking so many identical questions across programs, the survey enabled us to present comparative findings throughout this report. In some cases, however, cross-program differences reflect real policy differences in program purposes and approaches; this study's approach should not be construed as implying that all programs ought to be administered identically. For all nine programs, tailored questions about performance indicators, mandated targeting, assessment, and other administrative procedures were added to the core survey. Finally, a separate survey was developed and administered to the relevant program coordinators in the 12 states selected to participate in the "Ed Flex" program.

Out of a possible 468 surveys, 447 were completed, a response rate of 96 percent.

Survey Respondents

To identify our respondents for the follow-up study, we again called each individual identified by ED as the state contact person or coordinator for each of the nine programs in each of the 50 states plus the District of Columbia. We asked that person if he or she would be able to answer questions about cross-program coordination, subgrant applications, project monitoring, accountability, and technical assistance under that program. We also asked for the name of anyone else in federal program administration at the state level whom we should interview regarding these issues.

As was true in the baseline study, the respondents we ultimately identified and interviewed were managers who: (1) often administered more than one federal or state program; (2) varied in the length of their administrative experience; (3) worked out of a variety of offices and divisions that might or might not be housed in the state education agency (SEA); and (4) might supervise or be supervised by other respondents to this survey. In addition, the Title I coordinator was often the respondent for both the Title I and Neglected or Delinquent programs; respondents for the Eisenhower Professional Development and Title VI programs were sometimes the same person.

II. Flexibility: Do States and Districts Continue to Experience New Latitude in Implementing the Law?

According to the reauthorized Title I, "Decentralized decision-making is a key ingredient of systemic reform. Schools need the resources, flexibility, and authority to design and implement effective strategies for bringing their children to high levels of performance" [Sec.1001(c)(8)]. To help states in their efforts to raise the academic achievement of all students to high standards—recognizing that there may be many ways to do so—the Goals 2000 Act and the IASA amendments attempted to offer states greater flexibility in the use of federal program resources and in the administration of federal program services. This flexibility for states mirrored the flexibility that policymakers sought to offer to schools and school districts. Believing that schools, districts, and states should have the freedom to do what it would take to raise students' achievement, unencumbered by administrative barriers, the laws encouraged cross-program planning as well as coordination of administrative and operational activities, consolidation of administrative funding, and consolidated plans or applications from local school districts or other subgrantees.

In this chapter, we discuss the ways in which state program administrators have continued to make use of the flexibility provisions in the new legislative framework and the extent to which they have moved beyond attention to procedural provisions—such as consolidated planning and cross-program communication—and begun focusing on the task of using the flexibility provisions in the legislation to align program services and operations to support state content and performance standards and thereby improve student achievement. Specifically, this chapter discusses the extent to which program administrators (1) perceived that their flexibility had increased in the four years after the reauthorization of ESEA, (2) were using each of several administrative provisions in the legislation and how using those provisions affected their work, and (3) encouraged program coordination at the local level.

States' Administrative Flexibility

"Flexibility" throughout the intergovernmental system is a watchword of IASA. Four years after authorization, did more state administrators of IASA programs think their own flexibility had increased than did in 1996-97 when the baseline study was conducted? And what more had they done since 1996-97 to avail themselves of various options intended to increase flexibility and cross-program coordination?

Perceptions of Increased Flexibility

Two-thirds of state administrators of ESEA programs believed that their own flexibility had increased in the four years after reauthorization. In fact, the majority of administrators of all seven ESEA programs who were asked to compare current administrative flexibility to that which they had prior to the 1994 reauthorization[2] reported experiencing increased flexibility. Compared to survey data collected in 1996-97, this finding shows a significant change in administrators' perceptions of flexibility, especially in the programs other than Title I (the only one in which a majority of administrators had reported an increase in administrative flexibility at the time of the earlier survey). Only seven percent of respondents in 1998 reported that they found no increase at all in administrative flexibility since the reauthorization; almost one-third of respondents had made that claim in 1996-97 (Table 1). A number of administrators still said in 1998 that their program has always offered flexibility: "There is no need for additional flexibility because it is already there" (Eisenhower Professional Development). Nevertheless, there was an overall rise in perceptions of increased flexibility. This may result from the fact that the legislation was no longer new; administrators had had time since 1996-97 to familiarize themselves with the reauthorized ESEA and better understand and act upon the flexibility it affords them. This notion is borne out by the fact that greater numbers of administrators in 1998 reported using more of the new administrative procedures that the reauthorized ESEA affords them (i.e., for program operations, local applications, monitoring, professional development, or technical assistance) than did in 1996-97. Specifically, 54 percent of program managers for Title I, Even Start, Migrant Education, Neglected or Delinquent, Eisenhower Professional Development, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, and Title VI reported using four or five new administrative procedures in 1998, compared to 37 percent of program managers reporting for those same programs in 1996-97.

Changes in recent years in the kinds of signals that the U.S. Department of Education is sending to state administrators also appear to have contributed to perceptions of increased flexibility, as the following comment suggests:

> From the federal level, there seems to be more flexibility than at the state level, for whatever reason. Federal guidelines now, more often than not, emphasize flexibility: "I'm not going to tell you how to write your plan, but here is a set of questions and answers." (Goals 2000)

---

[2] Administrators of Goals 2000 and Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (TLCF) programs did not answer the question about flexibility prior to reauthorization because these programs did not exist prior to the 1994 reauthorization.

Table 1

Extent to Which State Administrators Find the Reauthorized Legislation Gives Them More Administrative Flexibility Than They Had Before the Reauthorization, by Program (N=332)[1, 2]

Taking into account all of your offices' responsibilities under this program, to what extent do you find that this legislation gives you more administrative flexibility than you had before the reauthorization?

	Number of State Administrators Reporting That Reauthorization Gives Them Administrative Flexibility:				
Federally Funded Education Programs	**To a Considerable Extent**	**Somewhat**	**Not at All**	**No Change**	**Don't Know**
Title I, Part A (N=49)	24	19	0	3	3
Safe & Drug Free Schools and Communities (N=47)	10	19	3	11	4
Title VI (N=48)	14	16	7	7	4
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=49)	15	18	4	7	5
Education of Migratory Children (N=45)	9	19	3	13	1
Even Start Family Literacy (N=49)	9	18	2	16	4
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=45)	14	13	3	12	3
TOTAL	95	122	22	69	24

---

[1] Respondents were administrators of the seven reauthorized ESEA programs (excluding Goals 2000 and TLCF, which are new, not reauthorized legislation).

[2] Programs are listed in order of appropriations size throughout this document.

In addition, it appears that administrators are more aware of the waiver option than in 1996-97 and recognize it as another vehicle through which they can obtain needed flexibility; this was especially true among program managers in states participating in the Education Flexibility Partnership Demonstration Program (Ed-Flex).[3] The most frequent response by state administrators to the question about additional flexibility needed was: "We are an Ed-Flex state; we don't need more flexibility" or "We are an Ed-Flex state; if we need more flexibility, we'll take it."

When asked whether they need additional flexibility, most administrators reported that the legislation affords them ample flexibility; nevertheless, some cautioned that perhaps they have been given too much flexibility, thereby exposing programs to a variety of problems. Administrators commented:

> The flexibility makes the program easy to administer and well-liked. It can be adapted to help meet state and local goals. However, the flexibility has probably made it more vulnerable to politics at the state and federal levels. (Title VI)
>
> I believe it is flexible enough. I think maybe there could be a little less flexibility to make sure [that] targeted people are being served. (Migrant Education)
>
> Flexibility is a double-edged sword. We can have so much flexibility that it becomes meaningless—you have no guidance then. (Eisenhower Professional Development)

Finally, some program administrators explained that although they may have the flexibility they need from the federal level to successfully administer their programs, state-level policies and practices can curtail the flexibility that the reauthorized ESEA affords them:

> The federal law is sufficiently flexible, but the state is inflexible in some areas. The governor has a lot of influence over the program. When Even Start funds subgrantees, its recommendations are usually overridden by the governor's office. As a result, the federal process that safeguards neediest programs often gets sacrificed. (Even Start)
>
> If our state legislature allowed us to manage funds in a different way (i.e., consolidate) it would be great. Our state is our own barrier. (Title VI)
>
> In the state, there is too much control by the state legislature. We end up not able to make decisions based on educational concerns because the legislature makes decisions based on political concerns. (Goals 2000)

---

[3] Established by the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, Ed-Flex gives participating states the "power to waive requirements of certain federal education programs, including Title I and the Eisenhower Professional Development Programs" in exchange for increased accountability for results. Without Ed-Flex, states and school districts may ask the secretary of education to waive these requirements; with Ed-Flex, states have the authority to make those decisions at the state level. [Ed-Flex Fact Sheet. ED, 1996b]

The perception of increased flexibility did vary by state, but again, not by the sizable numbers reported in 1996-97. That is, in 1998, there were 34 states in which most of the ESEA program administrators (four or more of seven) reported at least some increase in their flexibility; in 1996-97, this was true for only 12 states. Moreover, in 1998, there were only three states in which just one administrator or none reported an increase in flexibility; in 1996-97, this was true in 11 states. In the 12 Ed-Flex states, 74 percent of all administrators reported an increase in flexibility (in 1996-97, it was 47 percent); in the non-Ed-Flex states, the figure was 61 percent (in 1996-97, it was 38 percent).

What Did "State Flexibility" Mean to State Administrators?

In describing the administrative flexibility available to them since reauthorization, state program managers expressed two major themes: (1) the opportunity to coordinate and collaborate with other federally funded programs and (2) the opportunity to support local reform plans. The first theme was also prominent in responses collected during the baseline study; the second, however, grew in frequency, suggesting that states may have moved further along in their thinking about the ultimate purpose of their programs: to support local reform efforts. In addition, program managers also pointed to several areas in which they felt they needed additional flexibility, although most of their concerns were related to program-specific legislative requirements. A sizable number of state administrators talked about the need to consolidate program reporting requirements to more closely track with the goals and objectives set forth in their consolidated state plans.

Coordination and collaboration among administrators. As was true in 1996-97, in responses to a variety of open-ended survey questions, many respondents talked about the opportunity to coordinate and collaborate with other program administrators. The following comments were typical:

> Flexibility has helped us coordinate and integrate with the other programs; it has reduced barriers and territorial issues to some degree. (Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities)
>
> Flexibility has increased program planning and coordination among other programs. (Eisenhower Professional Development)

In some cases, as was true in 1996-97, respondents took this theme a step farther and cited benefits to students that could result from their coordination and collaboration:

> Having the flexibility to join with other programs and to use funding in a blended fashion provides integrated service delivery which improves performance. (Even Start)
>
> The flexibility has allowed us to work across programs. The SEA no longer distinguishes between programs—it focuses more on student needs. (Title VI)

Finally, many state administrators cited the decrease in the level of duplicated effort among federal programs as one of the more practical benefits associated with cross-program coordination and collaboration:

> It is easier to look at the consolidated application and consolidated reviews. It conserves effort and reduces duplication. (Eisenhower Professional Development)

> It is easier to do some things because of the additional flexibility. For example, in the past we had to send separate approval letters for each program in a district; now we can just send one letter. (Title I)

Supporting local reform. When state program managers were asked to elaborate on the effects of new flexibility at the federal and state levels on their programs, many program managers described efforts to help districts find ways—sometimes creative ones—to use federal program resources to meet local needs rather than using administrative flexibility to simply administer programs within an explicit framework of program regulations and requirements. These responses signaled an unmistakable shift in outlook and orientation from those made in 1996-97 when, in response to a similar question, respondents were more apt to cite improvements in state-level functions, such as flexibility to coordinate and collaborate with other program administrators and the opportunity to consolidate state administrative funding. As the following comments suggest, however, few administrators mentioned the relationship between flexibility and improvements in program services or student outcomes:

> Goals 2000 is rather non-prescriptive, and the flexibility in terms of the performance of the program is that local school districts have truly been able to identify and respond to local needs versus responding to either state or federally imposed requirements. That's fairly unprecedented for a federal program to be that non-prescriptive. (Goals 2000)

> The fact that flexibility is extended to LEAs and allows them to design a program that meets their needs is great. We're finding that LEAs are having a tremendous impact because they have designed something that fits their needs; they're not having to force things (i.e., some externally developed agenda) on communities. (TLCF)

> The new flexibility in the law enhances productivity and accountability. The law gives us the authority to really adapt programs to local needs. It is very accommodating. (Migrant Education)

> Flexibility has helped shift funds to areas with greater needs and enabled programs to better meet locally identified and locally defined needs. (Title VI)

Consolidating federal reporting requirements. Several program managers expressed frustration at not being afforded the same flexibility in responding to federal reporting requirements that they enjoy with respect to program planning and funds consolidation; some argued that ED's program-specific reporting requirements work to dissuade program managers from coordinating program services and activities as well as causing states to impose undue reporting burdens on districts. The following comments were typical:

> Require the same data from all federal programs—we need consolidated reporting to go with consolidated planning. We need a set of consistent regulations; there should be consistent data that will be accepted in all the programs. The regulations have to be reviewed to determine what's consistent in them. We go crazy with all the individual inquiries. (Title I)
>
> It's very difficult to evaluate federal programs. With reauthorization, we were asked to consolidate programs, but ED didn't respond by consolidating the evaluation process, so we're still going out to districts asking for program information. The federal government wanted it to be less burdensome, but with evaluation, we've become more burdensome. We've worked—and the Comprehensive Center has worked—on developing a consolidated evaluation instrument. But as it stands now, we make a lot of unfair demands on districts. (Eisenhower Professional Development)
>
> The SEA is still in the evolving process of trying to coordinate all functions, all decision-making, and we're not quite there yet. We've made a lot of progress, but we do at times impose separate requirements on districts, and that is really driven by ED imposing separate requirements on us, and we, in turn, do it to the districts. We're all trying to align, but we're not quite there yet. (Goals 2000)

As some state administrators suggested, by not consolidating federal reporting requirements, ED may be undermining its efforts to encourage state and local coordination and collaboration in support of standards-based reforms:

> What would be helpful is a single integrated program performance report that cuts across all these sources of funds and focuses in on the impact that these resources have had on implementing a system of standards and assessments. It would make sure we had developed it together at the state level, as opposed to having separate reports. (Goals 2000)
>
> The biggest thing we need, if ED is really pushing for integration, consolidation, and leveraging funds, is to look at differences at the federal level among reporting requirements for each program. Each program has its own evaluation at the federal level—Eisenhower Professional Development, Title IV, Title VI. Those evaluations force reporting out by program and that tends to be self-defeating. If ED could develop a consolidated reporting mechanism for programs, it would facilitate what it wants to happen in terms of integration. (Goals 2000)

State-Level Program Coordination

According to ED's cross-cutting guidance regarding state implementation of the amendments to ESEA, consolidated planning would enable states "to plan how to use all of their federal funds to support overall state goals" (ED, 1996a; p.7). In 1996-97, we learned that almost all state administrators of the programs included in this present study (with the exception of the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (TLCF), which was not operating in 1996-97) participated in the development of their state's consolidated plan, but that only a few states had achieved an across-the-board consolidation of administrative funds. What we did not know was to what extent consolidated planning was translating into coordinated program administration and operations; many administrators' responses suggested that they were just planning for planning's sake, because they did not speak about the more substantive outcomes of planning. Moreover, we did not know whether and to what extent administrators were organizing program administration and operations around supporting state goals or whether consolidating administrative funds was translating into increased administrative and operational capacities among programs. Accordingly, we followed up in all these areas in 1998. This section discusses the types of flexibility provisions states used in 1998—including consolidated planning, consolidation of administrative funds, and Ed-Flex waivers—and state administrators' perceptions of the effects of their use.

State Coordination of Program Services and Operations

Most state administrators (81 percent) reported conducting specific administrative or operational activities in coordination with other federally funded education programs (Table 2). The types of coordinated activities most frequently cited were: (1) providing technical assistance to districts and schools (89 percent); (2) holding local application and planning workshops (79 percent); (3) monitoring local projects (70 percent); and (4) decision-making with respect to allocating program resources to districts and schools (60 percent). Far fewer programs collaborated around collecting student (40 percent) or program (41 percent) performance data or in conducting local needs assessments (44 percent) (Table 3).

Titles I, Eisenhower Professional Development, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, and Title VI tended to coordinate their administrative and operational activities together, as did Goals 2000 and TLCF. The other, smaller programs, including Even Start, Migrant Education, and Neglected or Delinquent, did not necessarily form their own coordinated unit; rather, they were either included or excluded—in no consistent pattern—from the larger group of coordinated programs. Even Start tended to be the biggest outlier with respect to program coordination, often citing Adult Education

Table 2

State Administrators Who Report Conducting Administrative or Operational Activities in Coordination with Other Federally Funded Education Programs, by Program

(N=434)

Since January of 1997, has your program conducted specific administrative or operational activities (e.g., monitoring local projects, providing technical assistance to districts and subgrantees, etc.) in coordination with other federally funded education programs?

Federally Funded Education Programs	Number of State Administrators
Title I, Part A (N=49)	45
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (N=48)	40
Goals 2000 (N=46)	38
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=49)	34
Title VI (N=48)	42
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	46
Education of Migratory Children (N=47)	35
Even Start Family Literacy (N=50)	37
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=47)	36
TOTAL	353

Table 3

Types of Administrative or Operational Activities State Administrators Report Conducting in Coordination with Other Federally Funded Education Programs, by Program

(N=353)

Since January of 1997, what among the following administrative or operational activities has your program conducted in coordination with other federally funded education programs?

Federally Funded Education Programs	Number of State Administrators Reporting That the Types of Activities They Coordinate With Other Federally Funded Education Programs Include:								
	Monitoring Local Projects	Holding Local Application/ Planning Workshops	Providing Technical Assistance to Districts and Schools	Providing Before- or After-School or Summer School Services	Decisionmaking with Respect to Allocating Program Resources to Districts and Schools	Collecting Student Performance Data	Collecting Program Performance Data	Conducting Local Needs Assessment	Other
Title I, Part A (N=45)	34	37	41	20	26	22	19	16	3
Safe & Drug Free Schools and Communities (N=40)	28	39	35	22	26	16	18	21	5
Goals 2000 (N=38)	24	24	32	11	24	16	14	15	5
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=34)	22	24	26	7	18	11	13	20	3
Title VI (N=42)	33	39	39	17	29	17	19	22	6
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=46)	31	39	42	12	26	14	16	21	6
Education of Migratory Children (N=35)	25	25	32	22	18	17	17	19	5
Even Start Family Literacy (N=37)	25	22	34	15	24	14	15	14	4
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=36)	26	29	33	10	20	13	13	9	4
TOTAL	248	278	314	136	211	140	144	157	41

and Early Childhood Education programs as its predominant collaborating partners. As one Even Start coordinator explained: "We don't collaborate with other federal programs because it makes more sense to collaborate with state and local early childhood education programs."

Although states reported doing a great deal more to coordinate administrative and operational activities than was evident in 1996-97, it is important to note that it took a long time to get to this point, and many programs are still not participating in coordinated activities. Evidently, state administrators are still "learning about each other's programs" and attempting to identify ways that they can work together; they have only just begun coordinating certain administrative and operational activities, and only with a core group of programs (typically, Titles I, VI, Eisenhower Professional Development, and Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities):

> We are trying to pilot test how well school districts will adapt to consolidated programs. We did not want to throw them all on them at one time. We may include other programs in the future, depending on the success of the pilot test. (Title VI)
>
> The state is still in the process of change and has only started coordinating services and activities with a few programs. We will add programs because we are all under the same associate superintendent. (Eisenhower Professional Development)
>
> We are just beginning to coordinate programs. These were the first ones. . . we are still in the process of reorganization. (Goals 2000)
>
> To really coordinate well takes time and we're just in the first stages of it. There's just not time to coordinate. We have plans to, but we're not there yet. It takes time to figure out how to coordinate. (Eisenhower Professional Development)

When asked why administrative and operational activities are coordinated with some programs and not with others, state managers often explained that the programs that were included in the consolidated state plan are usually the ones included in broad-based coordination efforts. Other responses clustered into the following three categories: (1) the organization of the SEA impedes efforts to include all programs in coordinated activities; (2) some programs are more difficult to work with because of the targeted populations they serve or the discretionary nature of their grants award system; and (3) not all federal programs share the same focus.

Organizational structure of the State Education Agency (SEA). Many administrators explained that no matter how desirable it might be to coordinate administrative and operational activities with other federal programs, the organizational structure of the SEA simply stands in the way:

> Things are spread around a fairly large area. We are close to some programs but not others. (Goals 2000)

> Not all programs are in the same division. I coordinate with ones I have authority over. Federal programs are under different associate superintendents and different directors. When you try to coordinate efforts, you rely on supervisors to relay messages to their people. Some folks are pretty [protective] about their programs. They see any kind of coordination as a dilution of their program and they fight it tooth and nail. (Title I)
>
> Working across divisions is difficult because of the different principles that guide each division. (Title VI)

Others explained that the state political context within which they operate federal programs also has some bearing on the extent to which they are able to conduct cross-program coordination:

> The culture of the state bureaucracy has not been to value collaboration and coordination because everything was an elevator going up and down, not across, because it was driven by either federal or state funding. Things were seen as needing to be departmentalized in that way, and changing mindsets is very difficult to do. (Goals 2000)

The role of smaller federal programs in coordinated services and activities. Although 81 percent of the respondents reported conducting administrative or operational activities in coordination with other federally funded education programs, there was markedly less participation in those coordinated activities among administrators of the smaller or discretionary grants programs—Migrant Education, Even Start, and Neglected or Delinquent. Roughly one-fourth of the administrators for these programs said that they were not coordinating any administrative or operational activities with other federally funded education programs. In addition, a sizable percentage of administrators for the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (31 percent) were non-participants in cross-program coordination of services and activities. Many of the TLCF program administrators explained that they have not yet participated in cross-program coordination of administrative and operational activities simply because their program is just getting started: funding awards were made to districts as recently as September 1998. TLCF managers said that they have simply not had time to do any program administration beyond awarding grants, but have every intention of coordinating administrative and operational activities with other programs in the future:

> The newness of my program and other federal technology initiatives makes it difficult to coordinate more. Technology leadership is new and very busy. We haven't had time to coordinate with everyone yet.
>
> We're a relatively new program. We're just getting rolling. In year two, we started a much fuller collaboration and we intend to expand [it] in year three.

Regarding the reasons why the smaller and discretionary grants programs—Even Start, Migrant Education, and Neglected or Delinquent—are not participating in cross-program coordination of administrative and operational activities, many managers of the formula-based programs explained that, at a practical level, the timelines and deadlines for applications for most discretionary grants programs simply do not match those for formula-based programs, making coordination difficult:

> Because of the funding cycle of the programs, the times at which the local applications for competitive grants are due are staggered and local applicants aren't applying for more than one competitive grant at a time. (Title I)
>
> We decided to consolidate activities and programs with the ones that were most feasible and we just haven't expanded yet. These programs (Titles I, II, IV, and VI) work together the best. . . . Migrant only operates during the summer, Even Start just wants to do everything themselves. It just worked to use these programs; they have the same clients, reporting periods, etc. (Title I)
>
> We started the consolidated process in what we thought would be a small, logical way. The four programs included (Titles I, II, IV, and VI) have lots of commonalities related to administration and operations. We may add other programs as we get further along; we have to start somewhere and didn't want a large group to begin with. (Eisenhower Professional Development)

The reasons that smaller and discretionary grants program administrators offered for not participating in cross-program coordination of administrative and operational activities were fairly specific. For example, several coordinators of Migrant Education explained that because the migrant program operated in the summer months, there was no opportunity to coordinate services and activities with other programs, as one Migrant Education administrator's comment conveys: "We don't coordinate with any other programs because the migrant program is in the summer and other programs operate during the school year."

As was true in 1996-97, some of these programs' administrators expressed concerns that coordination of administrative and operational activities creates the opportunity for smaller programs to be absorbed by larger ones and that the needs of the populations served by the smaller programs could go unmet:

> From the perspective of a state that operates its Migrant Program almost exclusively in the summer, all of the emphasis on coordinating and consolidating planning for the regular school year isn't a problem, but it puts Migrant to the side. It's not a huge barrier, but it's easy for states to leave mobile kids out. It just requires that I be vigilant that Migrant funding be used to meet [the] needs of migrant kids before funds go to overall school improvement. (Migrant Education)

A few administrators of some of these smaller programs, nevertheless, recognized the potential benefits of cross-program coordination to the particular needs of the populations they serve: "I like that I can get other team members involved in Even Start. They are now more knowledgeable of Even Start than before. On site visits, as a team, this enables others to make more informed and broader assessments of the program: more people can comment on what they see. The consolidation and coordination is hard, but in the long run, it will be good for the [SEA] and the IASA programs." (Even Start)

Program focus. Several administrators explained that they did not coordinate with programs that did not share the same program purposes and focus; this shows incomplete acceptance of the notion behind consolidated planning, which was to enable states "to plan how to use all of their federal funds to support overall state goals" (ED, 1996a; p. 7). The following administrators' comments suggest that there are still significant numbers of state managers who were continuing to focus on program-specific concerns rather than on broader issues related to standards-based reform and improving student achievement:

> It depends on the particular activity. If interests and objectives align, we coordinate. (Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities)
>
> Similarities in focus among the programs are the reason I coordinate with some programs and not with others. (TLCF)
>
> The reason for coordinating with some programs and not with others is the focus of those programs. (Title VI)
>
> We only coordinate with programs that focus on families with young children. (Even Start)
>
> I'm more likely to coordinate with programs that have direct implications for Migrant Education. (Migrant Education)

Consolidated Administrative Funding

Each federal program allows state education agencies to set aside a small percentage of the funds for state-level program administration. These set-asides typically pay the salaries of state coordinators as well as covering the other expenses of application review, technical assistance, monitoring, and the like. The IASA law allowed states to make a change in the way they accounted for these funds: it authorized them to consolidate into a single pool the administrative set-asides under Title I, Even Start, Migrant Education, Neglected or Delinquent, Eisenhower Professional Development, TLCF, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, Title VI, and Goals 2000. The notion behind this additional flexibility was that it would "make it easier [for state administrators] to plan across programs" (ED, 1996a; p. 7).

Not every state was eligible for this consolidation; the law provided this option only for SEAs in which the majority of the agency's resources came from non-federal sources. As was true in 1996-

97, among those states that were eligible in 1998, it appears that some did not choose to consolidate funds and some were selective about including programs in the consolidation.

Extent to which state administrators experienced a consolidation of administrative funds. In just five states did state administrators of the eligible programs report an across-the-board consolidation of state administrative funds; in another three, none answered "yes" to this question (i.e., all administrators said either "no" or "don't know"). Aside from these 8 states where the picture was clear, an additional 10 states had just one administrator whose report differed from that of his or her colleagues (e.g., there were eight "no" answers and one "yes," or eight "yes" answers and one "no" or "don't know"). Compared to data collected in 1996-97, there were fewer states (18 compared to 28) in which most administrators were sure that their state is or is not consolidating administrative funds.

The remaining 33 states presented a murkier picture, with two or more state administrators disagreeing with their colleagues; a typical pattern of responses in these states was two saying "yes," four "no," and one "don't know." As was true in 1996-97, these were probably states in which consolidation had been put in place on a limited basis, across just a few of these nine programs. Among those states where half the eligible programs were consolidating and the other half were not, there were no apparent patterns in terms of the types of programs that tended to consolidate and those that did not, with one exception: Goals 2000 and TLCF were least likely to be part of the consolidation. Slightly more administrators in 1998 (53 or 12 percent) than in 1996-97 (39 or 11 percent) reported that they did not know whether their state had consolidated its administrative funding; of these, TLCF administrators (the newest program and the one least likely to be included in coordinated activities) were the most numerous.

The rather dramatic decrease in the number of states reporting that they have consolidated administrative funds since 1996-97 may be explained, in part, by the fact that many SEAs experienced significant turnover in the past few years; consequently, some program managers are fairly new to their positions and may simply not know whether their program's administrative funds are part of a consolidation. Another possibility is that state administrators in 1998 have a better understanding of the legislation and of administrative operations within their SEA and are able to more accurately respond to the question about whether their state is consolidating its administrative funding than they were in 1996-97.

It appears that among the nine states that reported an across-the-board consolidation of state administrative funds in 1996-97, six are continuing, for the most part, to consolidate (although no longer an across-the-board consolidation, a significant majority of administrators in these states reported consolidation). Among the remaining three states, one state had experienced significant staff turnover and two of the nine respondents in that state did not know whether their state was consolidating administrative funds. In the other two states, there appeared to be a breaking in the ranks. That is, some administrators (two in each state; all four administer small federal programs) have apparently decided to discontinue their participation in the consolidation of administrative funds within the SEA.

In addition, a significant majority of administrators in six states that did not report consolidation in the baseline study now report consolidating their administrative funds. In 1996-97, the majority of administrators in three of these states had said their state was not consolidating funds; in 1998, a majority of administrators in two of these three states indicated that their SEA had been downsized, which may have prompted the need to organize and use resources more efficiently. As one administrator explained: "With diminishing dollars at the state level, the SEA is dipping further into areas where federal funds can complement state funds." (Migrant Education)

Among the eight states that definitively reported not consolidating administrative funds in 1996-97, six continued in 1998 to forgo the use of this particular legislative provision. Of the remaining two states, one has a majority of administrators participating in the consolidation; the other has Title I and Even Start now making use of this provision. Some of the reasons administrators offered for why their states are not consolidating administrative funds were that: (1) their state legislature prohibits funds consolidation and (2) budget offices within SEAs—fearing audit exceptions—are not prepared to handle funds consolidation.

Effects of consolidating administrative funds. To get a sense of the effects of consolidation, we can look at two groups of respondents: those in the 13 SEAs in which a significant majority of state administrators answered "yes" to the consolidation question; and all respondents who answered "yes," regardless of what their colleagues said.

Among the 13 states where a significant majority of state administrators said funds had been consolidated, there were five states in which most respondents said their work had been affected at least "somewhat" or "to a considerable extent" by administrative funds consolidation. Among these five states, program managers were very clear about whether the effects of consolidation were positive or negative; perceptions of effects varied by state rather than by program. A majority of administrators in four of these five states saw the effects of consolidation as positive. The following finding was typical:

- The consolidation has changed the way the SEA functions to a considerable extent, making staff responsible for regions and specific content areas rather than specific programs. The Title I director said that it has increased the SEA's capacity to engage in a variety of reform activities, including the provision of technical assistance.

In the state where a majority of administrators saw the effects of consolidation as negative, the following comments were typical:

> The consolidation reduces the available resources to administer the program. (Eisenhower Professional Development)
>
> I think the biggest effect is that it has definitely limited the resources available for administering the programs. The dollars are not readily available. What we are given each year depends on the department. (Even Start)
>
> We lost about one-third of our money, which tremendously impacts our ability to have sufficient staff and to use discretionary funds. (Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities)

Finally, in one state where all state administrators said funds had been consolidated, most of them said that funds consolidation had not affected their own work at all. This response seemed to reflect a combination of perceptions: that they had already worked with one another before the reauthorization and that the change had not affected the way they worked with local districts.

Looking at all the state administrators across all states who said their agency had consolidated administrative funds, 69 percent reported some effect on their own work (Table 4), with no significant variation by program. While a few administrators cited, as they had in 1996-97, the lifting of a requirement to keep "time and effort" logs as a positive effect of funds consolidation, the tone of most comments in 1998 regarding the effects of funds consolidation was decidedly negative. Some complained that consolidation had resulted in their having less money to administer their programs and to award to subgrantees: "I now have less program money at the state level as a result of the consolidation" (Eisenhower Professional Development) and "Less money goes to the subgrantee because funds get stuck in the SEA" (Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities). Other administrators complained that they had lost control of their program resources as a result of consolidation:

> I have less control. I now have to ask permission to earmark money for training. I used to be able to make my own decisions for spending money. Money is now earmarked by the powers that be. (Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities)
>
> Consolidation of administrative funds has in some ways led state and local programs to become nonexistent by shifting the focus away from more targeted funding. It has limited us as to how much we can do with the administration of the program because we don't have access to those funds. It has allowed other policymakers to determine what happens in the Eisenhower Professional Development program, even if they don't have a true sense of the needs in science and mathematics professional development. (Eisenhower Professional Development)

Table 4

Extent to Which Consolidation of Administrative Funding Affects the Way Administrators Do Their Job, by Program
(N=183)

To what extent has this consolidation of funds affected the way you do your job?

	Number of State Administrators Reporting That Consolidation of Funds Has Affected Their Job:			
Federally Funded Education Programs	**To a Considerable Extent**	**Somewhat**	**Not at All**	**Don't Know**
Title I, Part A (N=27)	11	10	5	1
Safe & Drug Free Schools and Communities (N=21)	6	9	6	0
Goals 2000 (N=13)	5	4	3	1
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=8)	1	4	1	1
Title VI (N=23)	7	6	9	2
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=26)	12	8	5	1
Education of Migratory Children (N=25)	9	8	7	1
Even Start Family Literacy (N=19)	10	5	4	0
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=21)	7	5	8	1
TOTAL	68	59	48	8

Despite administrators' generally negative views of the effects of funds consolidation on their work, a substantial majority of administrators for Title I, Title VI, and Eisenhower Professional Development reported that consolidation had increased their programs' capacity to: (1) participate in state-level cross-program planning, (2) coordinate program services and operations among other state and federal programs, and (3) accept and review consolidated subgrant applications (Table 5). The majority of Title I administrators, in particular, believed that consolidating administrative funding increased their capacity to do a range of things, including providing technical assistance to subgrantees, monitoring local projects, and participating in the development of state standards and assessments. The only activity that fewer than half the Title I administrators believed had been positively affected by consolidating administrative funds was engaging in data-driven decision-making. Altogether, no other program gave consolidation of administrative funding such a ringing endorsement.

The apparent lack of a connection between general negative attitudes regarding funds consolidation and the acknowledgment that consolidation has increased some programs' administrative and operational capacity may be explained in terms of the administrative functions that state managers value. That is, although consolidation of administrative funds increases administrators' capacity to do some things, they are not the types of administrative or operational activities or tasks that administrators necessarily want to do or for which they require additional capacity.

Those programs for which a majority of administrators did not perceive an increase in their capacity to engage in and coordinate broader administrative tasks as a result of consolidating administrative funds included Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, TLCF, Migrant Education, Even Start, and Neglected or Delinquent. With the exception of Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, many of these programs were not generally engaging in coordinated program activities and therefore would not have recognized or benefited from the increased capacity that consolidating administrative funding seemingly afforded administrators of Titles I and VI, and Eisenhower Professional Development. Interestingly, administrators of Migrant Education and Neglected or Delinquent did not perceive effects from the consolidation of funds in 1996-97, either. As was true then, because Migrant Education and Neglected or Delinquent programs typically serve children outside the regular school setting, they may offer more limited opportunities to share administrative responsibilities such as, for example, monitoring. Many Migrant Education programs operate during the summer months, thus limiting the opportunities to participate in integrated monitoring visits during the regular school year. Similarly, Neglected or Delinquent programs

Table 5

State Administrators Reporting That Consolidating Administrative Funds Has INCREASED Their Program's Capacity to Do Things, by Program

(N=183)

To what extent has consolidating administrative funds affected your program's capacity to do the following?

	Number of State Administrators Reporting That Consolidating Administrative Funds Has INCREASED Their Program's Capacity to:								
Federally Funded Education Programs	Provide Technical Assistance to Subgrantees	Participate in State-Level Cross-Program Planning	Coordinate Program Services and Operations Among Other State and Federal Programs	Monitor Local Projects	Participate in the Development of State Standards	Participate in the Development of State Assessments	Accept and Review Consolidated Subgrant Applications	Engage in Data-Driven Decision-making	Other
Title I, Part A (N=27)	17	22	22	17	15	16	18	12	1
Safe & Drug Free Schools and Communities (N=21)	8	9	9	5	5	3	8	3	1
Goals 2000 (N=13)	7	10	9	6	7	5	6	8	0
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=8)	3	5	5	5	3	3	3	2	0
Title VI (N=23)	8	18	16	10	9	8	14	7	0
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=26)	13	20	19	13	10	9	15	7	0
Education of Migratory Children (N=25)	9	12	11	6	6	6	10	7	0
Even Start Family Literacy (N=19)	7	10	10	9	6	3	7	7	0
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=21)	12	10	11	8	6	6	10	8	0
TOTAL	84	116	112	79	67	59	91	61	2

(Subpart 1)[4] operate in state institutions, where other state administrators of federal education programs are unlikely to visit as part of their monitoring.

State Participation in the Education Flexibility Partnership Demonstration Program or "Ed-Flex"

Established by the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, Ed-Flex gives participating states the "power to waive requirements of certain federal education programs, including Title I and the Eisenhower Professional Development Programs" in exchange for increased accountability for results. Without Ed-Flex, states and school districts may ask the Secretary of Education to waive these requirements; with Ed-Flex, states have the authority to make those decisions at the state level (Ed-Flex Fact Sheet, ED, 1996b).

Among the 12 states that received Ed-Flex authority, administrators reported that the local waiver provision was, at best, underutilized and at worst, ignored. Administrators in nine of the 12 states said that they believed that their state and districts were not fully using the Ed-Flex authority. Specifically, of the 10 administrators who were able to estimate the number of districts in their states that had received waivers, seven said the number was 20 or fewer. The most common explanation administrators offered for underuse of the waiver authority was that the reauthorized legislation grants programs sufficient flexibility, thereby rendering Ed-Flex superfluous; as one administrator pointed out: "There is so much flexibility built into ESEA that there is not a big need for more." In characterizing the way districts have used the waiver authority, many state administrators lamented the fact that few districts seem to recognize their state's Ed-Flex status as an opportunity for change. Rather, districts are asking for waivers of some of their more mundane administrative responsibilities—such as keeping time and effort logs—and the consequent effects on program administration and operations are negligible:

> I feel the Ed-Flex is underutilized. No major innovative waivers are asked for. It hasn't increased or decreased the performance of the program, although the field does seem happier.
>
> As an Ed-Flex state, we had the ability to give administrative waivers, so we waived time and effort requirements in some districts—but that didn't affect anything we did except to reduce administrative record keeping.
>
> We have a real dichotomy here. We have a lot of flexibility, but LEAs haven't taken advantage of it. Most LEAs use the flexibility to implement Title I schoolwide programs.

---

[4] Subpart 2 of the Neglected or Delinquent Program is covered by another ED-funded study and was therefore not included in either the baseline or follow-up studies of state implementation of ESEA or Goals 2000.

> What happens is a lot of times with the federal laws, what people do is they assume that what they used the funds for are the only things they can use them for and don't think "outside the box."

On a more positive note, most state administrators (8) reported including student performance among their criteria for assessing the impact of waivers and said they will revoke district waivers as a result of poor student performance—although none had, as yet, done so.

> We look for the impact of the waiver on student performance as well as program performance—what they've been able to accomplish as a result of the waiver and how it has affected the performance of students.
>
> When districts apply for waivers, they have to provide us with information on how the waiver they are getting is going to increase student performance, and how they are going to measure it. We ask them then to report their progress in reports, using the criteria that they have established.

Finally, despite their rather limited use among districts, few state administrators would be willing to discard waivers as meaningless: most (8) say they believe—to some or to a great extent—that the Ed-Flex waiver authority (1) furthers state reform efforts and (2) improves the coordination of federal resources with state reform efforts.

Local Administrative Flexibility

Goals 2000 and IASA amendments aimed to increase flexibility in schools and school districts so that administrative requirements would not impede progress in bringing all students to high standards. The survey asked state administrators to report on the extent to which the administrative flexibility afforded state education agencies was being extended to the local level.

Requiring or Accepting Local Consolidated Plans

Slightly more than half the state administrators responding to the survey said they allowed school districts or other subgrantees to submit a single consolidated application—a plan describing the intended uses of funds under more than one program. That is, about 57 percent of all program administrators reported that they required (30 percent) or accepted (27 percent) consolidated applications from districts (Table 6). As usual, however, there were important program-by-program variations to this finding. As was true in 1996-97, more than three-fourths of the administrators for the formula grants programs-- Title I, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, Eisenhower Professional Development, and Title VI--reported that they required or accepted consolidated

Table 6

Policy on Consolidated District Applications, by Program (N = 434)

Does your program require or accept consolidated plans or applications (that is, combined applications for more than one program) from local school districts or other subgrantees?

	Number of State Administrators Reporting That Their Programs:				
Federally Funded Education Programs	Requires Consolidated Subgrant Applications	Accepts Consolidated Subgrant Applications	Requires a Separate Subgrant Application	Piloted Consolidated Subgrant Applications in Some Districts in 1997-98	Makes Other Arrangements for Subgrant Applications
Title I, Part A (N = 49)	25	16	5	2	1
Safe & Drug Free Schools and Communities (N = 48)	21	15	9	1	2
Goals 2000 (N = 46)	6	5	35	0	0
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N = 49)	3	6	37	1	2
Title VI (N = 48)	22	20	6	0	0
Eisenhower Professional Development (N = 50)	22	20	6	1	1
Education of Migratory Children (N = 47)	11	16	16	1	3
Even Start Family Literacy (N = 50)	6	6	38	0	0
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N = 47)	14	13	18	1	1
TOTAL	130	117	170	7	10

applications, as compared with fewer than one-third of the administrators for the discretionary grants programs, including Goals 2000, TLCF, and Even Start.

Consolidated applications or plans were most frequently in place, then, across the programs that offered formula funding to districts. In explaining this phenomenon, many respondents noted—as they had in 1996-97—that accepting or requiring local consolidated applications was a new administrative procedure that was simpler to introduce to a core group of programs—especially ones that were not targeting particular populations—to test the processes of developing a common subgrant application and reviewing consolidated applications. Administrators explained in 1996-97 that once they had an opportunity to learn from their experience, they might eventually include more federally funded programs in a consolidated process. Since 1996-97, however, it appears that some states have tried introducing a few of the discretionary grants programs into local consolidated plans, only to quickly reject the option because programs (largely the discretionary grants programs themselves) were displeased with the quality and quantity of information the applications provided:

> I have talked with folks who have done these consolidated things, and we have enough problems trying to find the information we need without sifting through everyone else's information. I would rather have the things I'm looking for, rather than things the Eisenhower Professional Development and Title VI person would need, but that I don't need. It is the efficiency of getting things approved and getting on with it. (Migrant/Neglected or Delinquent)

Another important development in state-level program administration since 1996-97 is the increase in the percentage of administrators who reported requiring—versus merely accepting—consolidated local plans or applications. In 1998, 30 percent of program administrators required local consolidated applications, compared to 22 percent who did so in 1996-97. This increase, again, signals a shift in the mindset of state administrators away from state-level administrative concerns and toward finding ways to better support local efforts to improve student achievement, as the following comments illustrate:

> Consolidated local applications are required in order to coordinate the utilization and impact of funds toward all students' attainment of challenging performance standards. (Title I)

> [We require consolidated local applications] because we are trying to promote whole-school planning and the consolidated use of resources, rather than separate planning by program streams. We want districts to look at the needs of students and how the various streams can promote meeting them. We want districts to look at what the kids need, and then the resources available to meet the needs, rather than [engaging in] separate plaining by program stream before examining student needs. (Goals 2000)

> The SEA wants school districts to see, at a glance, all of the different funding sources that are available to them. They also want to allow districts to coordinate resources and programs better—to know what the right hand and the left hand are doing. (Even Start)

Quality of local consolidated plans. The majority of program administrators who accept or require local consolidated plans or applications expressed general satisfaction with the quality of certain information that the local plans provide. More than half the administrators who require or accept local consolidated plans or applications reported that they provide information "very well" or "fairly well" on summaries of services rendered (58 percent) and indicators of collaboration with other programs (68 percent) (Table 7a). Important program-by-program variations to these findings were present, however. That is, two-thirds or more of the administrators of Title I, Goals 2000, and Title VI reported that consolidated local plans or applications provided summaries of services rendered very well or fairly well, as compared to fewer than half the administrators for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, TLCF, and the Migrant Program. Regarding information being provided "not very well" or "poorly," 30 percent of respondents said that the local consolidated plans or applications provided "evidence of additional services needed" not very well or poorly, with Title I, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, and Eisenhower Professional Development among the programs most frequently selecting this response option (Table 7b).

Local implementation of consolidated plans. Regarding the implementation of consolidated local plans, more than one-fourth of the 264 state administrators who reported requiring or accepting consolidated local plans said that they did not have enough information about local implementation to report on its strengths and weaknesses. Among those who did believe they had enough information to comment (190 state administrators), the vast majority focused on the strengths of local implementation, with 83 percent reporting that working together across programs has "helped local staff learn about each other's programs and identify opportunities to coordinate administrative and operational activities." In addition, 71 percent believed that a consolidated plan sharpens local educators' focus on enabling all students to meet the standards; this was a particularly frequent selection among administrators of Title VI, Eisenhower Professional Development, and Goals 2000 (Table 8).

Requiring Separate Subgrant Plans or Applications

Administrators whose programs required them to make discretionary grant awards were more frequently reporting requiring separate subgrant applications than administrators of other programs. For example, Even Start, Goals 2000, and TLCF, all of which target limited resources to districts most in need, were less likely than other programs to require or accept consolidated applications.[5] When asked why programs continue to require separate local applications, the most common explanation was

---

[5] For Even Start, this may also be a result of the fact that eligible entities for subgrant awards are not simply LEAs, but LEAs in partnership with at least one other entity, such as a non-profit, community-based organization.

Table 7a

State Administrators Reporting on How Well Local Consolidated Plans or Applications Provide Them with Information about Their Programs, by Program
(N=263)

How well would you say the local consolidated plans or applications provide you with the following types of information about [this program]?

	Number of State Administrators Reporting That Local Consolidated Plans or Applications Provide Information "VERY WELL" or "FAIRLY WELL" on:									
Federally Funded Education Programs	**Outcome Data on Program Participants**	**Community Needs Assessment**	**Participation and/or Attendance Data**	**Evaluation of Service Quality**	**Summaries of Services Rendered**	**Evidence of Additional Services Needed**	**Evidence of Varied Demographic and Ethnic Group Participation**	**Indicators of Collaboration with Other Programs**	**Client Satisfaction Ratings**	**ED's Program Performance Indicators**	**Other**
Title I, Part A (N=44)	18	24	23	15	32	13	23	34	8	11	3
Safe & Drug Free Schools and Communities (N=39)	10	19	16	10	18	8	9	24	8	12	2
Goals 2000 (N=11)	4	9	7	6	8	7	7	9	1	2	1
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=12)	3	4	6	4	5	5	8	7	3	4	0
Title VI (N=42)	9	20	22	10	28	14	17	30	6	13	3
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=43)	11	18	16	9	27	16	18	33	4	13	3
Education of Migratory Children (N=31)	9	10	8	6	10	11	15	17	4	9	1
Even Start Family Literacy (N=12)	3	5	6	5	7	5	7	7	2	2	1
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=29)	10	9	13	9	17	6	14	17	4	7	2

Table 7b

State Administrators Reporting on How Well Local Consolidated Plans or Applications Provide Them with Information about Their Programs, by Program

(N=264)

How well would you say the local consolidated plans or applications provide you with the following types of information about [this program]?

Number of State Administrators Reporting That Local Consolidated Plans or Applications Provide Information "NOT VERY WELL" or "POORLY" on:

Federally Funded Education Programs	Outcome Data on Program Participants	Community Needs Assessment	Participation and/or Attendance Data	Evaluation of Service Quality	Summaries of Services Rendered	Evidence of Additional Services Needed	Evidence of Varied Demographic and Ethnic Group Participation	Indicators of Collaboration with Other Programs	Client Satisfaction Ratings	ED's Program Performance Indicators	Other
Title I, Part A (N=44)	6	5	5	7	5	15	9	6	10	10	1
Safe & Drug Free Schools and Communities (N=39)	12	12	7	13	9	16	13	9	7	8	1
Goals 2000 (N=11)	4	1	1	4	2	3	3	1	4	3	0
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=12)	3	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	0
Title VI (N=42)	13	8	7	12	4	11	10	6	11	7	0
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=44)	10	7	11	12	5	12	12	5	14	11	0
Education of Migratory Children (N=31)	9	11	12	12	10	11	8	8	13	10	2
Even Start Family Literacy (N=12)	3	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	3	0
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=29)	5	7	6	7	3	11	7	7	5	7	0

Table 8

State Administrators Reporting on the Strengths and Weaknesses of Local Implementation of Consolidated Plans, by Program

(N=264)

What are the strengths and weaknesses of local implementation of the consolidated plans, as far as you know?

	Number of State Administrators Reporting That:					
Federally Funded Education Programs	Working Together across Programs Has Been Difficult for Local Staff	Working Together Across Programs Has Helped Local Staff Learn about Each Other's Programs and Identify Opportunities to Coordinate Administrative and Operational Activities	A Consolidated Plan Sharpens Local Educators' Focus on Enabling All Students to Meet the Standards	A Consolidated Plan Detracts from the Attention Paid to the Purposes of This Program	Other	They Do Not Have Enough Information about Local Implementation to Report on Its Strengths and Weaknesses
Title I, Part A (N=44)	15	29	21	2	2	14
Safe & Drug Free Schools and Communities (N=39)	19	23	18	9	1	10
Goals 2000 (N=11)	6	7	7	1	2	2
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=12)	2	4	5	1	0	5
Title VI (N=42)	22	31	26	7	1	8
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=44)	22	31	26	5	1	9
Education of Migratory Children (N=31)	10	16	14	5	2	8
Even Start Family Literacy (N=12)	4	4	4	0	0	6
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=29)	11	13	14	1	0	12
TOTAL	111	158	135	31	9	74

that competitive grants programs operate on different grant cycles from the formula-based programs. Other explanations focused on (1) adherence to program requirements that, in some administrators' opinions, dictated separate applications, and (2) the notion that consolidated applications could not provide program administrators with the information they needed to judge program quality or local need or that other program administrators would be reviewing the applications but would not have the expertise to make those judgments. The following comments were typical:

> Separate applications are important for flexibility, mobility, and ability to respond to the needs of LEAs quickly. (Migrant Education)

> The information required by the N or D program is so different from others and because there are so few N or D programs, it makes it difficult to operate through a consolidated application. (Neglected or Delinquent)

> There is the concern that the other programs would not have the expertise to evaluate what would be an appropriate use of technology and what would not. (TLCF)

Factors Influencing Subgrantees' Decision to Submit a Consolidated Plan

Interviews with local federal program administrators about factors that influenced their decision regarding whether to submit to the state a consolidated application suggested that some states were not making it easy for districts to submit such plans. This finding represents a different perspective than that offered by state administrators in 1996-97, when several state administrators reported that many local administrators did not want to submit consolidated plans because they were still working within the boundaries of their categorical programs and resisted efforts to coordinate program services and activities. (Interviews with local administrators were not conducted as part of the baseline study.) In 1998, during site visits to 16 districts (two in each of eight states), we interviewed local federal program administrators and asked them about the factors that influenced their decision regarding whether to submit a consolidated application. Many explained that their state was simply making it too difficult to design a consolidated application:

> The state is requiring too much in the application. They are really asking for a separate application for each program stapled together. Districts do not have to mix and mingle abilities with their funds that make applying worth it. That is why there are only a couple consolidated districts in the state, and they are very small and rural.

> Although state administrators may say that they accept consolidated local applications, most do not actively encourage it and none provide technical assistance to districts on how to go about writing such an application. In addition, because the state has not removed its requirement for time and effort logs, writing a consolidated application is not a shortcut.

Some local administrators suggested that state managers do not know what a local consolidated plan ought to look like—nor how they can support local program coordination—and therefore are unable to offer districts much assistance. As one local administrator explained: "The state only encourages collaboration; they don't help locals consolidate. All the programs have separate accountability requirements and do not share mutual objectives." Another administrator pointed out that his district had received their program approval letters much sooner when they submitted separate applications: "We submitted our consolidated application in July 1998 and didn't receive formal approval until November 1998; in the old days, we would have gotten our approval letters by September. Once the state receives our application, they break it up by program for review."

On the other hand, in districts where consolidated planning was thought to be supported by the state, local administrators spoke glowingly about the opportunities consolidation was affording their communities. Specifically, local administrators in two states talked about consolidation opening the doors to a variety of new funding sources:

> There was an all-day meeting for Title I coordinators years ago related to the importance and inevitability of consolidating. We consolidated the first time we were able. They were good at giving us information and clear that they didn't know how it would work. The state is committed to the idea of consolidated planning. In less than four years, this school district has gained over $2.5 million in competitive grants. That's because the state could see we were trying to do consolidated planning and had our strategic plan.
>
> Having a consolidated plan gives us leverage to go after additional funding; we've gotten national grant awards from NSF and General Electric. These come as a result of presenting a unified local plan for improvement.

Summary: The Status of "Flexibility"

Compared to survey data collected in 1996-97, current findings show that perceptions of flexibility have changed significantly. Two-thirds of state administrators surveyed in 1998 believed that their flexibility had increased since reauthorization, whereas in 1996-97, Title I was the only program in which a majority of administrators reported an increase in flexibility.

Program managers' descriptions of the flexibility available to them also signaled a shift in perceptions since the baseline study. In 1998, many program managers described efforts to help districts find ways to use federal program resources to meet local needs; survey responses in 1996-97 indicated that program administrators were thinking of flexibility in a more limited way—primarily in terms of opportunities to coordinate and collaborate at the state level.

In another positive development since 1996-97, the study found an increase in the percentage of administrators who reported requiring—versus merely accepting—consolidated local plans or applications. This increase, again, signals a shift among state administrators, away from state-level administrative concerns and toward finding ways to better support and encourage local reform efforts.

However, the study also found some areas in which implementation of flexibility provisions fell short of the original hopes for the reauthorized legislation. Survey results showed that fewer states reported an across-the-board consolidation of administrative funds than in 1996-97, and the tone of most comments regarding the effects of funds consolidation was decidedly negative. Findings also suggested that the Ed-Flex waiver authority was underutilized. Finally, as in 1996-97, few administrators mentioned the relationship between flexibility and improvements in program services or student outcomes.

III. Accountability: To What Extent Are States Implementing Standards-Based Accountability Systems?

IASA, the federal legislation amending ESEA, includes provisions that connect program accountability to state systems of challenging content and performance standards. According to ED's cross-cutting guidance, the idea behind this mandate was to "[1] improve coordination of federal programs with state reforms and [2] instill in federal programs a culture of accountability and continual improvement" (ED, 1996a; p. 9). Advocates hoped that the accountability mechanisms created in response to these amendments would direct educators' and program administrators' attention to the challenge of bringing all students to high standards—and, further, that the magnitude of this challenge could stimulate big changes in program services. For the legislation to fulfill this hope, however, several structures and processes would have to be in place. Not only would states need ways of measuring student achievement, they would also need to lead districts and schools in the use of data to stimulate and guide improvements in program services.

In 1996-97, we found that with the exception of following some mandated procedures, such as identifying Title I schools in need of improvement, most program administrators gave rather limited evidence that they were attending to student performance. The follow-up survey explored the extent to which, four years after reauthorization, state administrators were organizing their work around aligning program services and operations with state content and student performance standards in an effort to improve student achievement. In addition, it explored the extent to which state administrators were using a variety of accountability tools—including student performance data, program implementation data, and program monitoring systems—to press vigorously for improving student performance. In addition, the follow-up study explored the extent to which Regional Service Teams—the federal program monitoring system—also worked to support state and local reform in an effort to improve student achievement.

Content Standards: How Are They Affecting State Administration of Federally Funded Programs?

After four years of implementing the law, it appears that state program administrators have come to recognize that supporting standards-based reform is part of their programs' purpose. Moreover, many administrators in their responses to open-ended survey questions mentioned raising student achievement—the ultimate goal of standards-based reform—as among their more fundamental program goals.

Content Standards and Federal Program Administration

In all states, content standards were part of the vocabulary of a significant number of state officials who manage federal programs. Overall, it appears that the majority of state administrators recognize that supporting standards-based reform is part of their programs' purpose: few respondents (6 percent) said that standards are "not relevant" to the services their program provides or that the program staff do not have the time (14 percent) or the expertise (4 percent) "to communicate a new program purpose driven by state standards" (Table 9). Evidence of attention to standards comes to light in administrators' descriptions of the changes they have made to some of their regular administrative tasks, including designing and approving local applications for federal funding and providing technical assistance. Because these comments were offered in response to open-ended questions, we cannot say exactly how many program administrators share these views, but they arose in more than a few interviews.

Local applications for federal funding. In responses to a variety of open-ended questions intended to shed light on the ways in which program administration and operations may have changed in the years since the reauthorization of ESEA, many state administrators—of all nine programs—referred to changes they have made in their application requirements in an attempt to focus local activity on supporting standards-based education, as the following comments illustrate:

> Standards and assessments are now the total focus of everything we do with our funds. They are part of the consolidated application—districts need to look at needs, and needs are based on what it will take to get the state standards in place. (Eisenhower Professional Development)
>
> In the next RFP for district improvement plans, we are asking people to develop plans that show how they are aligning local curriculum and assessment with state assessments and standards and also how they are using their data from [the state assessment] to realign their local practices and procedures. (Goals 2000)
>
> The RFP was changed to include a requirement to demonstrate how the program will support both the National Education Goals and the state standards. (Even Start)

Technical assistance. Many state administrators (although, by no means all) mentioned that attention to standards has helped bring focus to—and thereby improve—the quality of the technical assistance they fund or provide to districts:

> For technical assistance, we focus on how Title I is based on standards and an integral part of the schools. We are looking at more global issues, not just Title I issues. We are no longer in our silos. (Title I)

Table 9

State Administrators Who Report the Following Problems With the Implementation of Standards-Based Reform, by Program

(N = 430)

To what extent would you say this program or this state is experiencing the following problems with the implementation of standards-based reform?

	Number of State Administrators Reporting That the Following Are "Major" or "Moderate" Problems:										
Federally Funded Education Programs	Standards Are Not Relevant to the Services Their Program Provides	Standards Are Not Specific Enough to Guide Teaching and Learning	Assessments Aligned with Standards Are Not in Place	This Program's State-level Staff Does Not Have the Time to Communicate a New Program Purpose Driven by State Standards	This Program's State-level Staff Does Not Have the Expertise to Communicate a New Program Purpose Driven by State Standards	Standards Have Not Been Approved by ED	Some Districts Have Standards that Are Not Aligned with the State's Standards	State Standards Are Changing	State Assessments Are Changing	Other	No Problems
Title I, Part A (N = 49)	0	5	8	6	1	3	4	3	10	1	9
Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities (N = 48)	3	3	8	6	1	4	5	2	4	1	12
Goals 2000 (N = 44)	0	2	8	3	1	1	3	5	8	2	7
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N = 48)	3	2	10	6	1	0	5	4	9	2	7
Title VI (N = 48)	0	4	11	5	1	2	7	5	10	1	13
Eisenhower Professional Development (N = 50)	0	2	11	6	1	4	8	5	8	5	8
Education of Migratory Children (N = 47)	6	8	11	6	3	3	4	4	10	4	11
Even Start Family Literacy (N = 49)	7	7	13	8	2	3	2	3	7	2	11
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N = 47)	6	8	12	15	7	3	7	5	14	4	11
TOTAL	25	41	92	61	18	23	45	36	80	22	89

> Because of standards and assessments, there's been more of a focus. We're providing technical assistance to districts in and around Eisenhower Professional Development. We provided an overview of the test, then we moved into curriculum workshops to do training. Then districts asked us how to use the rubrics, how to fold them into instruction, how to use them with students. We provided that kind of technical assistance, and they used their funds to continue that kind of training. (Eisenhower Professional Development and Title VI)

Although standards seem to be taking a firmer hold on state administrators' conceptions of their program purposes and objectives, standards are not the sole anchor for federal program efforts. The survey data provide a window on administrators' attention to standards as a focus for capacity building: all program administrators were asked about the topics on which they provide or fund technical assistance to grantees. As was true in 1996-97, the state administrators of Eisenhower Professional Development, Title I, and Goals 2000 substantially outnumbered their counterparts in other programs in choosing "content or performance standards" as a focus for technical assistance (Table 10). The only change in 1998 was the increase in the number of Title VI administrators reporting that they fund or provide technical assistance on content or performance standards (from 30 in 1996-97 to 40 in 1998). Overall, the percentage of state administrators who reported funding or providing technical assistance to subgrantees on content or performance standards did not change much, rising from 56 percent in 1996-97 to 61 percent in 1998.

Raising Student Achievement

In 1996-97, substantial numbers of state administrators—in their responses to a series of open-ended questions—gave no evidence that their criteria for program success lay in the realm of student achievement. To follow up on this finding and delve a little deeper into its origins, we asked state administrators in 1998 to describe the ways in which their program's organization or operations affected the extent to which they could focus on improving student achievement. This time with a more focused question, state administrators were more likely to say they were addressing student achievement as part of their programs' purposes. They attributed this largely to (1) efforts to coordinate program administration and operations among other federal programs and (2) the implementation of state standards and assessment systems, sometimes after long delays.

Regarding cross-program coordination, there seemed to be a strong belief among some that coordinating federal program administration and operations at the state level gives managers greater incentive to focus on student achievement. That is, by coordinating technical assistance, monitoring, and other administrative tasks—and thereby reducing their administrative burdens—managers believe they have more time to focus on the complicated issue of improving student achievement:

Table 10

State Administrators Who Choose Content or Performance Standards as a Focus for Capacity Building, by Program (N=435)

In the past year, has your office funded or directly provided technical assistance to subgrantees on [content or performance standards]?

Federally Funded Education Programs	Number of State Administrators Who Fund or Directly Provide Subgrantees Technical Assistance on Content or Performance Standards	Number of State Administrators Who Do Not Fund or Directly Provide Any Technical Assistance to Subgrantees
Title I, Part A (N=49)	35	0
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (N=48)	19	0
Goals 2000 (N=46)	32	4
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=50)	25	2
Title VI (N=48)	40	2
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	46	0
Education of Migratory Children (N=47)	25	6
Even Start Family Literacy (N=50)	22	6
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=47)	23	14

> Having to be responsible for all of the programs affects your focus on improving student achievement. It has a positive effect because you can help teachers and administrators by speaking globally, instead of with a narrow focus, to help them see all of the things they have access to in order to make sure that Johnny achieves. (Eisenhower Professional Development)
>
> Coordination with other programs allows us to focus much more on improving student achievement. Encouragement from ED to coordinate access across programs and to make "need"—not programs—important, really helps sharpen our focus. (Goals 2000)

A lack of adequate staff was commonly cited as the reason why programs could not focus on student achievement. Indeed, as the following comments illustrate, administrators expressed intense frustration about their limited capacity to fulfill administrative tasks, let alone to go beyond minimal requirements:

> Just the fact that we are only a 1.5 FTE program and there is so much. . . we have to do for the feds and stuff, it is pretty hard to focus on anything more than just this program. Presumably, kids making healthy choices will ultimately improve their grades, but as far as a specific focus on student achievement, we are limited in our capacity to address this issue. (Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities)
>
> It's just me. I have very little staff to provide services in areas that would improve student achievement. If I had more staff, I would do a lot more regional training and would really look at the needs identified for districts and think about what Eisenhower Professional Development can do to help support those needs. (Eisenhower Professional Development)
>
> Because of understaffing, it's really hard to dedicate the time we should be dedicating to student achievement and improving program coordination. Most of our time gets spent on doing things that have to get done. We need more focus on student achievement, and for that, we need more staff. (TLCF)

Regarding the implementation of state standards and assessments, several program managers explained that they had not paid particular attention to student achievement in the past simply because it did not make sense in the absence of state standards and assessment systems: what, they asked, would they be measuring in order to assess student achievement against? As the following comments illustrate, having state standards and assessment systems in place can be a fairly powerful lever for improving coordination of federal programs with state reforms:

> We've got standards and curriculum assessments in place—now we are in the process of looking at what the new assessments are telling us and trying to retool the way we teach. We are moving to performance testing. We need to get the teachers up to speed on how the test will change the way we should be teaching students before talking about sizable gains in student performance on tests. We need to lay the groundwork first. (Goals 2000)
>
> Once the state adopts statewide assessments, we should be better able to measure students' progress and determine the needs of local schools. (Eisenhower Professional Development)

> Now that the curriculum frameworks and state assessment are in place, the challenge is to help students to achieve the state standards. (Title I)

Finally, although state administrators said more in 1998 about their efforts to focus program operations and activities on raising student achievement, they still expressed reluctance to link program success to student achievement. As the following section illustrates, student performance data were not yet cited as a significant source of information for administrators when judging their program successes and problems. This phenomenon, however, may say less about deep-seated convictions or behaviors, and more about simple pragmatism. That is, with the exception of Title I, state administrators argued that federal program reporting requirements create a disincentive by continuing to focus on process and inputs, rather than on outcomes such as improving student performance.

Uses of Data in SEA Program Management

As was true in 1996-97, it appeared that the goal of instilling a culture of accountability and continual improvement among those administering federally funded programs was unmet. While administrators were seemingly collecting or already have at their disposal a great deal of student performance and program implementation data, they were not using the data—or, at least, their purposes in using the data had little to do with judging the success of federally funded programs in raising student achievement.

Student Performance Data

Forty-two percent of all state administrators do not require subgrantees to report to the state regarding the performance of students participating in their programs. This phenomenon was most common among programs that do not provide direct services to students (Eisenhower Professional Development, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, Title VI, and the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund). However, substantial numbers of administrators of Migrant Education, Even Start, and Neglected or Delinquent also said they do not require their subgrantees to submit student performance data. As administrators of these smaller programs point out, however, districts face special difficulties in collecting and reporting student performance data for these programs due to the circumstances affecting the particular populations they serve. One administrator said:

> With Neglected or Delinquent, it's the lack of any long-term information on student achievement that makes it hard because the kids in N or D are in and out so quickly and their information doesn't go with them.

For Migrant Education, the problems are quite similar. Many states offer only summer migrant programs, and administrators argued that it is hard to measure student achievement because of migrant students' mobility; in addition, they observed that their program only serves migrant children for two to three months out of a year and they do not know what the achievement data would be telling them given the limited duration of the intervention.

As one might expect, given its requirement to identify schools and districts in need of improvement, Title I had the highest proportion of administrators (80 percent) who required subgrantees to submit student performance data to the state. The types of student performance data that administrators most frequently said they required from subgrantees suggest that increased attention to student achievement among federal program administrators may be beginning to take hold: of the 250 administrators who require districts to submit student performance data, 53 percent said they collect data on student performance results from the state assessment; and 42 percent said they collect performance results from tests other than the state's assessment (Table 11). Despite these advancements, the data show that there is still room for improvement. That is, 19 percent of state administrators report that they do not require subgrantees to submit any student performance data to the state.

Unfortunately, however, while administrators may be collecting student performance data, survey data also show that the number of state administrators who report using the data for any purpose has declined since 1996-97. That is, among the 293 state administrators in 1998 who reported requiring student performance data from subgrantees or obtaining such data from other sources, 23 percent acknowledged that they did not use the data for any purpose, compared to 15 percent in 1996-97 (Table 12). This was most common among administrators of Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities and Migrant Education. Of those who did say they use the student performance data they collect, most state administrators said they used it for some combination of purposes. The most common purposes were for (1) reporting to the federal government (58 percent); (2) reporting to local school districts, schools, and subgrantees (48 percent); (3) identifying districts in need of improvement (47 percent); and (4) identifying schools in need of improvement (44 percent). Program by program, Title I had the highest frequency of administrators using student performance data for these purposes. In fact, Title I administrators were the most avid consumers of student performance data, putting them to a variety of uses. That is, Title I administrators reported—in much higher frequencies than did other program administrators—that they used student performance data for: (1) identifying districts and schools in need of improvement (a legislative requirement); (2) assessing the progress of underserved ethnic and demographic groups; (3) reporting to managers in the state agency; and (4) reporting to local school districts, schools, and subgrantees.

Table 11

Student Performance Information That Local School Districts, Schools, and Subgrantees Are Required to Report to the State Regarding Program Participants, by Program
(N=250)

What information about student performance are local school districts, schools, and subgrantees required to report to this program regarding program participants?

Federally Funded Education Programs	Performance Results from the State Assessment	Performance Results from Tests Other than the State's Assessment	Performance Results from Course-Related Tests	Distribution of Student Grades	Rates of Student Participation in Accelerated Courses or Academic Honors Programs in High Poverty Schools	Examples of Student Work	Rates of Participation in Extracurricular Activities	Dropout Rates	Absentee Rates	Incidences of School Disruption	Other	None
Title I, Part A (N=44)	38	20	7	3	5	4	1	19	17	10	4	3
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (N=23)	4	3	1	0	0	0	1	13	9	17	5	5
Goals 2000 (N=27)	17	12	4	3	4	8	2	10	11	6	5	7
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=22)	6	6	4	3	1	5	0	3	2	2	6	9
Title VI (N=18)	11	8	5	2	1	4	2	12	10	6	5	1
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=21)	13	5	6	1	4	3	0	9	9	4	2	8
Education of Migratory Children (N=34)	19	15	10	9	3	6	2	11	15	5	9	5
Even Start Family Literacy (N=31)	5	20	8	3	0	11	3	12	10	1	14	6
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=30)	19	15	4	2	0	4	1	11	12	6	5	4
TOTAL	132	104	49	26	18	45	12	100	95	57	55	48

Table 12

Purposes for Which Program Offices Use Student Performance Data, by Program
(N=293)

How does this program use the student performance information it collects from the field?

Number of State Administrators Reporting That Their Program Uses Data on Student Performance for:

Federally Funded Education Programs	Identifying Program Services That Need to Be Extended or Reduced	Assessing Progress of Underserved Ethnic or Demographic Groups	Reporting to Managers within the State Agency	Reporting to the State Board of Education	Reporting to Local School Districts, Schools, and Subgrantees	Reporting to the Federal Government	Identifying Districts in Need of Improvement	Identifying Schools in Need of Improvement	Other Purposes	No Purpose
Title I, Part A (N=48)	26	28	23	20	31	40	41	44	3	4
Safe & Drug Free Schools and Communities (N=27)	9	4	7	6	10	11	7	4	1	13
Goals 2000 (N=32)	12	9	15	17	17	16	10	9	4	3
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=27)	10	9	6	7	8	13	9	9	1	8
Title VI (N=26)	6	6	9	4	9	15	13	9	3	6
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=30)	13	15	10	8	12	16	15	14	0	9
Education of Migratory Children (N=37)	18	13	9	4	15	19	14	11	1	12
Even Start Family Literacy (N=34)	15	13	14	7	20	16	11	10	5	6
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=32)	11	11	14	8	18	24	17	18	0	5
TOTAL	120	108	107	81	140	170	137	128	18	66

As was true in 1996-97, although most state administrators reported making some use of data on student performance, their answers to other questions showed that such data did not necessarily factor into their assessments of overall program quality. When we asked respondents how they judged the success of their work, most cited feedback from subgrantees, their own observations, and other anecdotal information. Few described their successes and failures in terms of student achievement. The following comment was typical:

> Eisenhower Professional Development is supporting standards-based reform, effective models of professional development, and the Title I initiatives. It has helped us in having the flexibility to address issues that we find important. Also, adding the additional content areas that we can focus on was helpful, particularly in the area of reading. (Eisenhower Professional Development)

Again, few state program administrators reported any systematic way of evaluating the success of their program; almost none referred to student performance data. A few administrators' comments highlighted the difficulty and confusion administrators may feel about the prospect of linking program success to student achievement:

> It is very difficult to prove a causal relationship between activities funded through the program and increased academic achievement—especially because so many reforms are occurring simultaneously in schools. (TLCF)

> It's hard for my program to focus on improvements in student achievement because the students move so much between districts and institutions. (Neglected or Delinquent)

> We don't have a good enough research base on evaluating the effects of technology on student performance. We are dealing with policymakers who want to know the bottom line, and the best we have is anecdotal evidence, and sometimes that is not good enough. (TLCF)

Program Implementation Data

Far more state administrators (95 percent) require subgrantees to submit program implementation than student performance data. The types of program implementation data that administrators most frequently said they required from subgrantees were: (1) summaries of services rendered (85 percent); (2) indicators of collaboration with other programs (63 percent); and (3) evidence of varied demographic and ethnic group participation (53 percent) (Table 13). Significant program by program variations persisted, however, with Even Start posting the highest percentage of administrators requiring almost every type of program implementation data, including summaries of services rendered (94 percent); indicators of collaboration with other programs (90 percent); levels of parent involvement (88 percent); levels of community involvement (82 percent); evaluations of service

Table 13

Program Implementation Information That Local School Districts, Schools, and Subgrantees Are Required to Report to the State Regarding Their Federally Funded Program, by Program

(N=433)

What information about program implementation are local school districts, schools, or other subgrantees required to report to this program?

	Number of State Administrators Reporting that the Types of Program Implementation Information That Subgrantees Are Required to Report Include:										
Federally Funded Education Programs	Summaries of Services Rendered	Evaluations of Service Quality	Client Satisfaction Ratings	Evidence of Additional Services Needed	Levels of Parent Involvement	Levels of Community Involvement	Evidence of Varied Demographic and Ethnic Group Participation	Indicators of Collaboration with Other Programs	Staff Satisfaction Ratings	Other	None
Title I, Part A (N=49)	34	16	5	15	28	17	32	27	3	2	6
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (N=47)	39	28	5	17	34	35	18	38	6	6	2
Goals 2000 (N=46)	42	29	9	15	22	20	14	25	9	8	3
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=49)	45	33	13	16	19	23	19	27	17	8	2
Title VI (N=48)	42	26	12	9	19	17	16	25	8	5	3
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	45	22	11	17	14	10	38	34	11	6	2
Education of Migratory Children (N=47)	40	20	7	24	29	21	28	30	5	4	4
Even Start Family Literacy (N=50)	47	36	24	30	44	41	37	45	15	8	1
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=47)	34	12	3	11	15	13	28	21	3	4	4
TOTAL	368	222	89	154	224	197	230	272	77	51	27

quality (72 percent), and evidence of additional services needed (60 percent). This may be the result of increased program evaluation requirements placed on local Even Start programs, and that more and more state Even Start coordinators may have come to value evaluation data and have found the resources to fund statewide program evaluations.

While there was less program by program variation in the numbers of state administrators using program implementation versus student performance data, the most common purpose for which these data were used was largely the same. That is, most administrators said they use program implementation data for reporting to the federal government (74 percent). The second most common purpose for which state administrators said they use program implementation data was to identify program services that need to be extended or reduced: 60 percent of the 431 state administrators who collect program implementation data reported using the data for this purpose (Table 14). In contrast, only 41 percent of the 293 administrators who collect student performance data reported using the data for this purpose. This variation, again, illustrates the reluctance among most administrators to use student performance data in program management.

Program Effects Resulting from the Availability of Student Performance and Program Implementation Data

The effects resulting from the availability of program implementation and student performance data are somewhat disappointing in light of the standards-based reform agenda. That is, with the exception of the Title I and Goals 2000 programs, just under half of the state administrators (44 percent) reported that program implementation and student performance data helped focus program staff on student results and achievement. Rather, administrators reported the effects were that such data (1) promoted coordination with other federal, state, and local programs (66 percent), and (2) improved communication with program subgrantees (64 percent) (Table 15).

Using the State-Level Procedure that Identifies Failing Schools

Among the 27 states where it was clear that the state had a process for identifying failing schools, a majority of program administrators in 14 states reported that they availed themselves of those data and made program decisions based on them. Overall, 118 of the 235 administrators in these 27 states reported using the state-level data identifying failing schools. Program by program, it appears that Title I is the largest consumer of the data, with only one of the 26 administrators responding to the survey in these 27 states reporting that such data were not used. Administrators of Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, Title VI, Goals 2000, and Neglected or Delinquent were the next most

Table 14

Purposes for Which Program Offices Use Program Implementation Data, by Program

(N=431)

How does this program use the program implementation information it collects from the field?

Federally Funded Education Programs	Identifying Program Services That Need to Be Extended or Reduced	Assessing Progress of Underserved Ethnic or Demographic Groups	Reporting to Managers within the State Agency	Reporting to the State Board of Education	Reporting to Local School Districts, Schools, and Subgrantees	Reporting to the Federal Government	Identifying Districts in Need of Improvement	Identifying Schools in Need of Improvement	Other Purposes	No Purpose
	Number of State Administrators Reporting That Their Program Uses Data on Program Implementation for:									
Title I, Part A (N=49)	24	18	22	10	21	31	27	25	3	11
Safe & Drug Free Schools and Communities (N=47)	35	12	23	16	28	40	32	12	6	2
Goals 2000 (N=46)	23	17	24	20	26	35	12	10	6	3
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=48)	31	23	29	27	27	42	23	19	5	0
Title VI (N=48)	24	8	18	7	18	39	22	12	5	4
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	25	19	25	11	20	40	22	17	2	5
Education of Migratory Children (N=47)	35	20	22	9	23	37	18	17	3	4
Even Start Family Literacy (N=50)	39	23	27	18	26	25	19	15	8	2
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=46)	22	9	15	8	12	30	13	12	1	6
TOTAL	258	144	205	126	201	319	188	139	39	37

Table 15

Program Effects Resulting from the Availability of Program and Student Performance Data, by Program
(N=429)

Which, if any, of the following have occurred as a result of the availability of program and student performance data, as described above?

	Number of State Administrators Reporting That the Availability of Program and Student Performance Data Has:								
Federally Funded Education Programs	Improved Communication with Program Subgrantees	Provided Documentation to Support Funding Requests	Enabled Us to Quickly Address the Performance Variability that Occurs Among Demographic and Ethnic Groups	Enabled Us to Quickly Adjust Programming	Focused the Program Staff on Student Results and Achievement	Promoted Coordination with Other Federal, State, and Local Programs	Enabled Program Staff to Inform the State Board of Education and Other Interested Public Communities about Program Status	Other	None
Title I, Part A (N=49)	36	19	14	24	41	35	26	1	1
Safe & Drug Free Schools and Communities (N=47)	33	32	3	32	12	34	26	6	1
Goals 2000 (N=46)	31	29	4	21	29	32	28	0	0
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=47)	25	27	6	20	16	24	27	2	2
Title VI (N=47)	27	22	2	18	22	31	17	1	3
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	27	21	9	23	25	36	18	1	5
Education of Migratory Children (N=47)	29	26	15	30	24	33	16	1	1
Even Start Family Literacy (N=50)	40	30	12	33	29	37	26	4	0
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=46)	25	14	8	17	20	22	13	1	4
TOTAL	273	220	73	218	218	284	197	17	17

frequent data users, with majorities of administrators of each of these programs reporting using the data or being in the process of developing an accountability system that makes use of state-level data identifying failing schools (Table 16).

State Monitoring

One way for state program offices to maintain a climate of accountability is by monitoring local school districts' programs. Under the new philosophy embodied in the reauthorized ESEA and Goals 2000, in which specific requirements take a back seat to the pursuit of more effective teaching and learning, monitoring could theoretically be retooled to provide a rigorous focus on program effectiveness and states' educational priorities. In 1996-97, although states had made progress in dismantling their old systems of monitoring for compliance with program provisions, they had far to go in building new monitoring procedures that would send a clear message about a new, standards-based accountability framework. In 1998, states were again asked about their monitoring systems.

Monitoring as Technical Assistance

Although the focus of monitoring continued to be on program effectiveness rather than compliance, 1998 survey data showed that compliance monitoring has not disappeared altogether. Rather, it is merely one among many priorities state administrators address through state monitoring visits. That is, when asked what priorities are addressed through state monitoring, the vast majority of program administrators (89 percent) cited compliance with federal program requirements. Other frequently cited priorities included (1) progress in tracking activities outlined in local plans (76 percent) and (2) use of federal funds to support state and local reform efforts (69 percent). With the exception of Title I, Even Start, and Neglected or Delinquent, only about half the program administrators cited student outcomes as a priority addressed through monitoring visits (Table 17).

Administrators in 1998 were more explicit than they were in 1996-97 about the kinds of technical assistance SEAs were offering as part of monitoring. That is, several administrators talked about focusing monitoring on program outcomes and finding ways to encourage districts to coordinate program services and activities:

> The monitoring is moving more toward standards. It is still in flux. We're trying to modify our [monitoring] items to look more at outcomes and not so much at compliance items. (Eisenhower Professional Development)

Table 16

State Administrators Reporting That Their Program Makes Decisions or Provides Services Based on State-Level Data Identifying Failing Schools, by Program (N=271)

Does your program make any decisions or provide any services based on state-level data identifying failing schools?

	Number of State Administrators Reporting That:			
Federally Funded Education Programs	**Their Program Makes Decisions or Provides Services Based on State-level Data Identifying Failing Schools**	**Their Program Is in the Process of Developing an Accountability System That Makes Use of State-level Data Identifying Failing Schools**	**Their Program Does NOT Make Use of State-level Data Identifying Failing Schools**	**They Don't Know**
Title I, Part A (N=34)	30	3	1	0
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (N=33)	16	10	7	0
Goals 2000 (N=30)	20	2	8	0
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=28)	13	7	8	0
Title VI (N=30)	16	5	9	0
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=29)	13	1	15	0
Education of Migratory Children (N=28)	10	2	16	0
Even Start Family Literacy (N=28)	11	2	15	0
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=31)	14	5	11	1
TOTAL	143	37	90	1

Table 17

Priorities State Administrators Report Addressing Through Monitoring, by Program
(N=415)

What priorities are addressed through state monitoring?

	Number of State Administrators Reporting that the Priorities They Address Through State Monitoring of Subgrantees Include:				
Federally Funded Education Programs	**Student Outcomes**	**Progress in Tracking Activities Outlined in Local Plans**	**Use of Federal Funds to Support State and Local Reform Efforts**	**Compliance with Federal Programs Requirements**	**Other**
Title I, Part A (N=48)	33	36	34	42	5
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (N=46)	22	41	29	46	7
Goals 2000 (N=43)	24	35	36	30	5
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=45)	21	38	30	34	6
Title VI (N=47)	23	32	38	46	5
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=46)	24	31	34	42	1
Education of Migratory Children (N=45)	25	29	29	43	3
Even Start Family Literacy (N=49)	36	42	23	45	9
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=46)	29	30	32	42	3
TOTAL	237	314	285	370	44

> We are focusing more on school improvement processes as opposed to monitoring or auditing of regulations. We are focusing more on data-driven decision making and helping districts to implement this, rather than focusing on compliance. We don't even call it monitoring anymore; we call it a quality review. We are also focusing more on integration of programs to meet student needs. (Goals 2000)

> [Through monitoring visits] we are trying to show districts how they can coordinate and consolidate their professional development funding. With federal programs, they often use money the same way over years. We are trying to get them to look at new ways of using their funding to maximize it. (Title I and Title VI)

Frequency of Monitoring

As was true in 1996-97, with downsizing of state administrative staffs, monitoring visits continued to be infrequent. Indeed, 1998 survey data show that more and more programs are visiting fewer and fewer subgrantees in a 12-month period. That is, in addition to the majority of administrators of Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, Eisenhower Professional Development, Title VI, and Neglected or Delinquent saying that fewer than one-fourth of their subgrantees received monitoring visits in the past 12 months (a finding that did not change from 1996-97), half or more of the Title I, Goals 2000, and TLCF program managers reported visiting subgrantees just as seldom (Table 18). In addition, about one-quarter of the respondents for Eisenhower Professional Development, Goals 2000, and TLCF reported that no subgrantees had received monitoring visits in the past 12 months, although about half these respondents specified that visits were planned for the future. It did appear, however, that some program administrators who said they did not visit any subgrantees in 1996-97 (Title VI and Neglected or Delinquent) were beginning to conduct monitoring visits—albeit infrequently—by 1998.

To compensate for the staffing shortages and consequent weakening of state monitoring systems, some programs—recognizing the need both to know what their subgrantees are doing and to communicate a clear message about program purposes and goals—developed alternatives to the monitoring visit. For example, many state administrators had developed district self-assessment guides that help districts identify their own problems and needs:

> We've changed the monitoring instrument so that all districts can use it to do an internal review rather than wait for us to come out. It includes principles of effectiveness. (Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities)

Table 18

Project Monitoring: Proportion of Program Subgrantees Receiving Monitoring Visits in the Past 12 Months, by Program

(N=433)

In the past 12 months, about what proportion of [this program's] subgrantees received monitoring visits?

Number of State Administrators Who Report the Following Proportions of Subgrantees Receiving Monitoring Visits:

Federally Funded Education Programs	Half or More	Between ¼ and ½	Fewer than ¼	None, But Plan to Conduct Visits in the Future	None	Other
Title I, Part A (N=49)	5	18	21	2	2	1
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (N=48)	3	14	23	2	5	1
Goals 2000 (N=45)	10	11	11	5	7	1
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=49)	12	10	10	7	7	3
Title VI (N=48)	4	17	18	3	3	3
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	3	17	17	5	6	2
Education of Migratory Children (N=47)	24	7	6	2	4	4
Even Start Family Literacy (N=50)	30	8	7	3	1	1
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=47)	11	11	16	2	6	1
TOTAL	102	113	129	31	41	17

> A self-assessment instrument that incorporates new state priorities and federal requirements has been prepared for school district use in determining quality and compliance across programs. (Title I)

> The need to know what was going on at the local level, and the state's not being able to visit them as often, prompted our design of a new district self-assessment instrument. (Title I)

Nevertheless, some administrators' comments about the positive effects of monitoring visits on state and local program administration and operations illustrate why efforts to devise substitutes for monitoring visits appear likely to fall short:

> The monitoring process really triggers our identification of technical assistance needs and triggers changes to our RFP and continuation process. For example, as a result of monitoring, we have information about where greater clarity is required in what the expectations are, what the requirements are. We make some changes to our entire subgrant process. We regard the monitoring process as evolving and dynamic and we're always trying to improve our effort based on the outcomes we see there. (Goals 2000)

- As a result of monitoring, program directors in one state listed several areas that have improved, including stronger leadership, better systems of data gathering, and a stronger emphasis on student outcomes. The Title I director feels the most important result of monitoring visits has been a stronger emphasis on planning. He said: "One of the things we're doing now is creating annual 'hot topics' with more in-depth questions on issues emerging as local or state priorities. This year, we are asking more in-depth questions about high-quality staff and services to students with limited English proficiency, and updating schoolwide plans."

Targeting of Monitoring

As was true in 1996-97, rather than focusing their relatively infrequent monitoring activities on districts that might be out of compliance or where student performance was low, state program managers most frequently reported using a routine cycle for monitoring visits (61 percent). However, 1998 survey data also showed that managers' targeting methods may be starting to change: more administrators said they are using information about compliance problems (45 percent versus 36 percent in the earlier survey) or student performance (21 percent versus 13 percent) to decide which subgrantees to visit, with no particular variation by program. However, the fact remains that few program managers use student performance information to target monitoring visits. This suggests, again, that federal efforts to promote a data-driven approach to program management have yet to pay off. While the percentage of Title I managers using student performance data was nearly twice as high as that for other programs, it still represented only 20 of 49 administrators (Table 19).

Table 19

Project Monitoring: Reasons Why State Administrators Visit Subgrantees, by Program (N=433)

On what basis is it decided which subgrantees to visit?

	Number of State Administrators Who Report That:				
Federally Funded Education Programs	There is a Routine Cycle for Monitoring Visits	Monitoring Visits are Triggered by Information That Grantees Are Having Trouble Meeting Program Requirements	Monitoring Visits Are Triggered by Information about Student Performance	Subgrantees Are Visited at Their Request	Other
Title I, Part A (N=49)	36	23	20	16	6
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (N=48)	24	25	10	27	11
Goals 2000 (N=46)	24	21	8	24	12
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=49)	23	19	6	28	11
Title VI (N=48)	33	25	9	21	8
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	23	22	11	22	5
Education of Migratory Children (N=46)	37	14	8	17	6
Even Start Family Literacy (N=50)	38	25	8	22	9
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=47)	28	21	10	21	6
TOTAL	266	195	90	198	74

Integrated Monitoring Visits

Integrated monitoring visits—monitoring visits in which a team of state program administrators collectively addresses the needs of several federal and state programs—continue to be the trend among federally funded programs; about 38 states (up from 27 in 1996-97) conducted some form of integrated monitoring visits. Among federal programs, integrated monitoring visits continued to be especially common for Title I, Title VI, Eisenhower Professional Development, and Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities programs (Table 20). A majority of administrators of Neglected or Delinquent programs also reported conducting integrated monitoring visits in 1998. For the most part, state administrators still cast a positive light on integrated monitoring visits, contending that such visits: (1) give a more complete picture of what subgrantees are doing by having a variety of programs represented (90 percent), (2) provide more solutions to subgrantees' difficulties, also by having a variety of programs represented (84 percent), and (3) have reduced the cost of monitoring for their respective programs (66 percent) (Table 21).

Nevertheless, some program administrators suggested that this method of monitoring, while generally accepted, does have its drawbacks. That is, 38 percent or more of the 213 state administrators who participated in integrated monitoring visits in 1998 raised many of the same concerns about the method as were raised in 1996-97, suggesting that the problems with integrated monitoring visits persist. That is, 46 percent of state administrators said the visits are too general or less in-depth than program- specific visits; 41 percent said the team members lacked the expertise to help individual programs; and 38 percent said the teams would overwhelm small districts where one person may administer several programs. One important development since 1996-97, however, is that relatively few administrators (22 percent) believed that integrated monitoring visits hampered their ability to collect the kind of program-specific information they needed. Migrant Education was the exception to this finding, with about half of program administrators reporting that integrated monitoring visits hampered their ability to collect program-specific information.

Other drawbacks include the fact that, as was true in 1996-97, integrated monitoring visits are still not resulting in the kinds of efficiencies that would translate into visiting more sites. Again, the survey data showed that the programs participating in integrated monitoring visits were generally visiting fewer subgrantees than were those conducting program-specific monitoring visits. However, integrated monitoring visits do appear to be a better guarantee that at least some sites will be visited, as opposed to none at all. That is, only six percent of administrators participating in integrated monitoring visits reported that none of their subgrantees were visited in the past 12 months, compared to 26 percent of administrators who conduct program-specific monitoring visits.

Table 20

State Administrators Reporting that Their State Conducts Integrated Monitoring Visits, by Program (N=428)[1]

Has this state conducted any integrated monitoring visits that address [this program] and other federal or state programs?

	Number of State Administrators Reporting that Their State:			
Federally Funded Education Programs	**Conducts Integrated Monitoring Visits That Include Federally Funded Programs Only**	**Conducts Integrated Monitoring Visits with Both Federally and State-funded Programs**	**Does Not Conduct Integrated Monitoring Visits**	**Does Other Things**
Title I, Part A (N=49)	19	17	13	0
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (N=47)	11	14	22	0
Goals 2000 (N=44)	9	13	19	2
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=48)	1	10	35	2
Title VI (N=48)	15	15	13	5
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=49)	14	17	16	2
Education of Migratory Children (N=46)	13	8	24	1
Even Start Family Literacy (N=50)	8	14	26	2
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=47)	15	11	20	1
TOTAL	105	119	188	15

[1] Responses do not always sum to total because managers who answered "Don't Know" are included in the N.

Table 21

State Administrators Reporting on the Strengths and Weaknesses Of the Integrated Monitoring Process, by Program

(N = 213)

[For programs participating in integrated monitoring visits] To what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding the strengths and weaknesses of your program's project monitoring process?

	Number of State Administrators Who Agree with the Following Statements Regarding the Strengths and Weaknesses of the Integrated Monitoring Process						
Federally Funded Education Programs	Integrated Monitoring Visits Have Reduced the Cost of Monitoring for This Program	Having a Variety of Programs Represented in the Monitoring Process Gives a More Complete Picture of What Subgrantees Are Doing	Having a Variety of Programs Represented in the Monitoring Process Provides More Solutions to Subgrantees' Difficulties	Integrated Monitoring Visits Are Too General/Less In-depth Than Program-specific Visits	Integrated Monitoring Hampers Our Ability to Collect the Program-Specific Data We Need	Integrated Monitoring Team Members Lack the Expertise to Help Individual Programs	Integrated Monitoring Teams Overwhelm Small Districts Where One Person May Administer Several Programs
Title I, Part A (N = 32)	20	30	28	14	5	11	12
Safe & Drug Free Schools and Communities (N = 24)	17	22	21	12	7	14	9
Goals 2000 (N = 20)	13	17	17	6	5	5	3
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N = 11)	6	10	10	5	1	3	5
Title VI (N = 29)	21	28	26	13	8	12	13
Eisenhower Professional Development (N = 30)	24	30	26	16	5	15	12
Education of Migratory Children (N = 19)	12	16	13	11	10	10	11
Even Start Family Literacy (N = 18)	9	15	15	11	4	7	8
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N = 30)	18	24	23	10	5	11	9
TOTAL	140	192	179	98	46	88	82

Integrated approaches to monitoring also appear to make the process more routine than do program-specific approaches. That is, programs participating in integrated monitoring visits are much more frequently reporting selecting subgrantees for monitoring visits based on a routine cycle (74 percent compared to 49 percent conducting program-specific visits), whereas administrators who conduct program-specific monitoring visits are more frequently reporting visiting subgrantees based on information suggesting that the grantee is having trouble meeting program requirements (83 percent versus 49 percent participating in integrated visits). However, despite the drawbacks of integrated monitoring, data show that programs participating in integrated monitoring visits are more frequently (albeit not in very large numbers) reporting using information on student performance to target monitoring activities (29 percent versus 12 percent).

Finally, as more and more states develop integrated monitoring systems, the fact that many still do not include some of the smaller or discretionary grant programs (e.g., Even Start, Migrant Education, and TLCF) continues to be a concern. As was the case for so many other administrative activities, program managers argued that they could not include the discretionary grant programs in the integrated monitoring visits because these programs: (1) awarded grants on a competitive basis and were therefore more interested in monitoring that focuses on program-specific issues or (2) were not among the programs accepting consolidated local plans or applications. Again, by excluding these programs, states may fail to send a coordinated, cohesive message to federal program subgrantees regarding standards-based reform.

Federal Monitoring

Early into the reauthorization period of ESEA, the U.S. Department of Education began to retool its program monitoring system in an effort to better support state and local education reform activities. Within the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE), ED established 10 Regional Service Teams (RSTs) charged with the responsibility of monitoring and providing technical assistance to state and local education agencies for programs authorized and administered out of OESE. RSTs have "primary responsibility for cross-functional activities for the purpose of delivery of services to the customers of the various programs within OESE." The 10 RSTs provide monitoring and technical assistance to state and local educational agencies through a variety of methods, including telephone contact, correspondence, and Integrated Review Team site visits. Much like state-level integrated monitoring visits, Integrated Review Team site visits include reviews of all elementary and secondary education programs in the state at one time. The goals of an integrated review are to:

- Assist states and local school districts in determining how federal programs support educational reform.

- Identify federal institutional barriers and make recommendations as appropriate.
- Become knowledgeable about a state's standards and assessments and the extent to which they promote student achievement.
- Monitor for compliance with essential program requirements (OESE Web Page).

As of late 1998, all but four states had been visited by a federal Integrated Review Team (IRT). Survey data show that among those administrators whose states had been visited by an IRT, many believed the visits were "somewhat" useful (37 percent); fewer respondents considered the visits to be "very useful" (18 percent), or "useful" (18 percent), and 19 percent said they believed that the visits were "not useful." Program by program, twice as many administrators of Eisenhower Professional Development, Title I, Goals 2000, TLCF, and Title VI viewed the IRT visits as "very useful" than did administrators of other programs; however, the highest frequency of responses among these programs was also that the visits were only "somewhat useful" (Table 22).

In their responses to an open-ended question asking administrators to offer their comments and concerns regarding these early integrated program reviews, many administrators said they were unimpressed by the knowledge base of ED staff and by the level of organization and focus evident in the visits; others complained that they had not been given enough information prior to the visit so that they might know what to expect; still others complained that their programs were virtually ignored by the IRTs. The following comments were typical:

> The Integrated Review Team's focus was too narrow and the team appeared inexperienced and unprepared. They were kind of putting things together as they went along. (Title I)
>
> I'd like the entire process to be spelled out earlier—the year before you're going to be reviewed, not in the fall before you're reviewed. Also, it should be more systematic—using rating forms, for example, rather than so subjective and casual. (Eisenhower Professional Development and Title VI)
>
> It was very obvious that program reviewers didn't know my program. (Eisenhower Professional Development)
>
> Not all programs were included; if you're going to do integrated monitoring visits, you need to include all the [federal] programs. (Title I)

Despite the problems, however, there was some good news. Some administrators believed the IRT visits were quite useful in that they forced programs to come together to prepare for the visits and thereby facilitated program communication and coordination:

Table 22

State Administrators Who Believe the U.S. Department of Education's Regional Service Team Visits Are a Useful Strategy for Implementing Federally Funded Programs to Support Comprehensive Standards-Based Reform, by Program

(N=286)

How useful do you think the Department's strategy for conducting integrated reviews has been to implementing [this program] to support comprehensive standards-based reform?

	Number of State Administrators Who Believe Regional Service Team Visits Are:				
Federally Funded Education Programs	**Very Useful**	**Useful**	**Somewhat Useful**	**Not Useful**	**Don't Know**
Title I, Part A (N=36)	9	6	13	8	0
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (N=36)	3	9	11	8	5
Goals 2000 (N=30)	7	10	9	2	2
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=10)	4	3	2	1	0
Title VI (N=33)	5	4	18	5	1
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=37)	10	4	17	3	3
Education of Migratory Children (N=36)	4	7	14	7	4
Even Start Family Literacy (N=33)	4	6	11	6	6
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=39)	5	3	12	14	1
TOTAL	51	52	107	54	22

> The integrated program review is a good idea because it requires us to come together in the preparation for it. It helps us see how all of the federal programs fit into the larger picture. (Even Start)

> It promoted dialogue within our department. We did a lot of pre-planning, so we got together at the state level to talk. That doesn't happen often, so that was very useful. Since then, we have talked about using federal funds together to achieve common goals. (Goals 2000)

Summary: Accountability Mechanisms in Place

After four years of implementing the law, it appears that state program administrators have come to recognize that supporting standards-based reform is part of their programs' purpose. State administrators are also increasingly likely to point to connections between program purposes and student achievement.

However, despite this progress, use of data in SEA program management remained a disappointment. While administrators seemed to have access to a great deal of student performance and program implementation data, quite a few were not using the data. Of those who were using the data, many reported using program implementation data for purposes of looking at issues related to program implementation and operations; far fewer reported using student performance data to judge the success of their programs in raising student achievement. Similarly, despite progress since 1996-97, states still had far to go in building new monitoring procedures that would communicate a clear message about a new, standards-based accountability framework. On a more positive note, however, more than half of state administrators reported developing program performance indicators, an increase over 1996-97 levels.

Finally, in the area of federal monitoring, state administrators' comments about federal Integrated Review Team visits suggested that this method of federal monitoring has not yet fulfilled its promise as a method by which to "facilitate, encourage, and assist state education reform efforts to improve the performance of all students" (Office of Elementary and Secondary Education web page).

IV. Technical Assistance: Are States Working Strategically to Build Local Capacity in Support of Standards-Based Reform?

According to ED, in order to ensure that all children meet high standards, the quality of teaching must be raised, and districts and schools "may need information and assistance" (ED, 1996a) in order to raise it. Federal program administrators could try to influence efforts to raise the quality of teaching and learning by strategically allocating technical assistance resources to inform, support, and promote districts' efforts to move toward standards-based reform.

In this chapter, we discuss the extent to which federal program offices in SEAs were bringing their resources to bear on building local capacity to improve teaching in support of standards-based reform, by comparing state-level technical assistance efforts in 1996-97 to those in 1998. In addition, we assess the extent to which states view other sources of assistance, particularly the U.S. Department of Education and its external technical assistance providers, as helpful to their efforts to build state- and local-level capacity in support of standards-based reform.

State Technical Assistance

As was true in 1996-97, agency downsizing in many SEAs continued to adversely affect the technical assistance capacity in federal programs. Sixty-three percent of all administrators surveyed in 1998 reported that their SEA had been downsized or reorganized in a way that affected the staffing of their program (Table 23). As a result, the majority of administrators (65 percent) reported only being able to meet their subgrantees' technical assistance needs "to some extent" or "a little" (Table 24). Administrators said:

> Overall, an issue here has been the decrease in staff. . . we've worked with quite a reduction this year; we have had three people doing what eight people used to do. Because of that, we have not been able to offer a lot of conferences, workshops, and things like that. We've been taking care of the administrative load only. (Title I)

> Lack of staff affects the program primarily in that I don't always feel like I am providing the best technical assistance to districts because of limited staff and time. (Goals 2000)

> We've been reduced from two bureaus to two people. We cannot adequately meet our own responsibilities for administering the program much less meet our technical assistance responsibilities to the LEAs. The reorganization [of the SEA] made us less 'in tune' with the subgrantees. There is mass confusion within the state office. (Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities)

Table 23

State Education Agency Downsizing or Reorganization, by Program (N=430)

Since the reauthorization of ESEA in 1994, has your SEA been downsized or reorganized in a way that has affected the staffing of this program?

Federally Funded Education Programs	Number of State Administrators Reporting That Their State Education Agency Has Been Downsized or Reorganized in a Way That Has Affected the Staffing of Their Programs
Title I, Part A (N=48)	37
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (N=46)	33
Goals 2000 (N=46)	22
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=49)	27
Title VI (N=47)	33
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	37
Education of Migratory Children (N=47)	28
Even Start Family Literacy (N=50)	29
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=47)	27

Table 24

Extent to Which Programs Were Able to Meet Their Subgrantees' Technical Assistance Needs in the Past 12 Months, by Program
(N=396)

In your estimation, to what extent has your program been able to meet your subgrantees' technical assistance needs in the past year?

	Number of State Administrators Reporting That, in the Past 12 Months, They Were Able to Meet Their Subgrantees' Technical Assistance Needs:			
Federally Funded Education Programs	**To a Great Extent**	**To Some Extent**	**A Little**	**Not at All**
Title I, Part A (N=49)	14	31	4	0
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (N=48)	14	27	7	0
Goals 2000 (N=42)	14	25	3	0
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=45)	13	27	5	0
Title VI (N=46)	19	25	2	0
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	19	27	4	0
Education of Migratory Children (N=40)	15	23	2	0
Even Start Family Literacy (N=44)	20	23	1	0
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=32)	9	17	6	0
TOTAL	137	225	34	0

With limited resources, state program administrators continued to make difficult choices about where to provide assistance. When asked about technical assistance needs that have gone—to a greater or lesser extent—unmet, state administrators most often said they are unable to get to every district that needs or requests help or that they are unable to provide sustained assistance or follow-up:

> The lack of staff inhibits our ability to meet all needs. The technical assistance is available if they call. Because of the size of the state, I am not sure how consumer-friendly the bureaucracy is. (Title VI)
>
> One difficulty is spreading . . . effective ideas. There is a lack of staffing to bring people together and maintain communication. There is a great gap between successful and unsuccessful districts. Some continue to flail, while others are making changes and improvements that are working. Because communication of effective programs and practices requires staff for managing and organizing [the information], this is partly a funding issue. More state funds would allow us to develop and maintain a better system of communication. (Goals 2000)
>
> There is a huge need regarding the implementation of the curriculum frameworks; the need outweighs the availability of funds and staff. (Goals 2000)
>
> Technical assistance needs exceed the program's capacity to meet them. I know it by the number of phone calls, what districts are asking for, and the number of schools we identified as in need of improvement, relative to the number of staff. Even the integrated review team told us we don't have enough staff to get the job done. We are being asked to provide technical assistance and in every program they want to see a comprehensive, coordinated effort, but some people just don't know how to do it. That is what takes more time; we're no longer just doing a checklist for our program review, but you go in and visit and there's also the follow-up. (Title I)

In general, it seems that increasing numbers of state administrators (81 percent, up from 72 percent in 1996-97) were relying on districts to know when they need help and how to ask for it, rather than actively assessing the local need for assistance in implementing their programs. The less frequently cited priorities for allocating a program's technical assistance resources tended to be those types of priorities that would require states to collect their own needs assessment data. That is, far fewer administrators report selecting districts that have: (1) low achievement, (2) less experienced program managers, or (3) program compliance problems. Nevertheless, more administrators gave priority to these areas in 1998 than did in 1996-97. That is, 55 percent of respondents in 1998 gave priority to districts with low achievement, compared to only 37 percent of respondents in 1996-97. In addition, 55 percent of administrators in 1998 gave priority to districts with program compliance problems, compared to 40 percent in 1996-97 (Table 25).

Table 25

Program Priorities for Allocating Technical Assistance Resources, by Program
(N=397)

What are the priorities for allocating this program's technical assistance resources?

	Number of State Administrators Whose Program Priorities for Allocating Technical Assistance Include:					
Federally Funded Education Programs	**Districts with Low Achievement**	**Districts with Less Experienced Program Managers**	**Districts That Request Help**	**High-Poverty Districts**	**Districts with Program Compliance Problems**	**Other**
Title I, Part A (N=49)	40	29	42	30	34	4
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (N=47)	16	26	35	19	25	8
Goals 2000 (N=42)	21	19	36	17	14	10
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=47)	24	24	37	32	15	12
Title VI (N=46)	29	22	40	18	29	4
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	31	26	46	19	31	1
Education of Migratory Children (N=40)	19	26	33	9	22	9
Even Start Family Literacy (N=44)	17	23	29	11	28	13
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=32)	21	22	26	11	19	4
TOTAL	218	217	324	166	217	65

State program administrators also faced choices about the content to emphasize in their technical assistance. A positive development in 1998 was that program administrators showed greater coordination in the content of the technical assistance they provided than in 1996-97 and much of that content focused on a standards-based reform agenda. Two-thirds or more of the respondents for Title I, Goals 2000, Title VI, and Eisenhower Professional Development said they funded or directly provided technical assistance to subgrantees on standards, assessment, use of data-driven decision making, use of technology, program coordination, and specific academic subjects. With the exception of program coordination, however, administrators of Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, TLCF, Migrant Education, Even Start, and Neglected or Delinquent programs less frequently reported offering help to subgrantees in areas related to standards-based reform. In fact, these programs appeared to maintain a technical assistance agenda that remained largely responsive to program-specific issues. For example, the most frequently cited technical assistance focus among administrators of Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities was school safety (94 percent); for TLCF, the focus was educational technology (86 percent); for Even Start and Migrant Education, it was working with families (82 and 74 percent, respectively) (Table 26).

The factors that most influenced state offices' selection of technical assistance topics included (1) program purposes and goals (59 percent) and (2) state goals and priorities (56 percent) (Table 27). Goals 2000, TLCF, Title VI, and Eisenhower Professional Development administrators were well above the average in relying on state goals and priorities to influence their selection of technical assistance topics. This is probably a function of the fact that these programs tend not to focus on the needs of a particular population and are thereby the most flexible in the way they set their priorities; moreover, these are also the program administrators who—in their responses to many open-ended questions—tended to be most attuned to the goals and priorities of their respective states. The following comments were typical among this group of administrators:

> We budgeted for the state content specialists for math and science using Eisenhower Professional Development and Title VI funds. We also have a strategic plan that addresses staff development to implement standards. We also have a project team at the state level to help with staff development, including implementing standards and assessments. (Eisenhower Professional Development and Title VI)

> I think that our modifying the program for our second application to focus more on state priority areas is working well. People are really asking, 'Is this project really going to have an impact on student performance in the long-run?' The provisions that allow us the flexibility to tailor the program according to our state needs have been very helpful. (TLCF)

> We have our comprehensive state plan; it's an umbrella for our reform goals. Our programs are supporting those goals. We're connecting instructional techniques with the new standards. (Eisenhower Professional Development and Title VI)

Table 26

Technical Assistance Topics States Fund or Directly Provide to Subgrantees, by Program

(N = 432)

In the past year, has your program funded or directly provided technical assistance to subgrantees on any of the following topics?

	Number of State Administrators Who Report Funding or Directly Providing Technical Assistance to Subgrantees on:													
Federally Funded Education Programs	**Content or Performance Standards**	**Student Assessment**	**Whole-School Improvement**	**Specific Academic Subjects**	**Meeting Needs of Special Populations**	**Adopting and Implementing Model Programs**	**Effective Roles for Instructional Aides**	**Techniques for Working with Families**	**Extended Instructional Time**	**Use of Data-Driven Decision Making**	**Use of Educational Technology**	**Program Coordination**	**School Safety**	**Other**	**No Technical Assistance Was Funded or Directly Provided to Subgrantees**
Title I, Part A (N = 49)	39	37	47	41	37	37	24	33	45	41	31	43	18	6	0
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (N = 49)	19	26	19	12	18	17	4	29	14	14	18	33	45	9	0
Goals 2000 (N = 46)	32	33	38	33	36	27	7	24	18	36	34	31	14	7	4
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N = 49)	25	15	22	14	29	32	8	9	8	21	42	31	7	10	2
Title VI (N = 48)	40	39	33	37	32	30	12	29	24	18	38	33	16	2	2
Eisenhower Professional Development (N = 51)	45	40	29	46	30	29	11	20	10	33	39	33	10	2	0
Education of Migratory Children (N = 49)	25	31	20	27	32	22	17	34	29	21	20	34	11	8	6
Even Start Family Literacy (N = 50)	22	23	6	13	32	26	4	41	13	21	10	36	8	13	6
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N = 40)	25	29	23	23	21	18	12	19	19	26	23	30	10	2	14

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 27

Factors That Most Influenced State Administrators' Selection of Technical Assistance Topics That Their Program Funded or Directly Provided to Subgrantees, by Program

(N=386)

In the past year, which THREE of the following factors most influenced your selection of technical assistance topics that your program funded or directly provided to subgrantees?

	Number of State Administrators Reporting That the Factors That Most Influenced Their Selection of Technical Assistance Topics Include:									
Federally Funded Education Programs	Program Purposes and Goals	Goals Arising form Consolidated Planning	State Goals and Priorities	Federal Legislation and Regulations	U.S. Department of Education Guidance	State Legislation and Regulations	Anecdotal Information About or Personal Observances of Subgrantees' Needs	Program Evaluation Data	State Student Assessment Data	Subgrantees' Suggestions	Other
Title I, Part A (N=48)	27	10	24	26	12	6	13	3	8	10	1
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (N=47)	29	9	17	26	20	6	8	7	6	12	1
Goals 2000 (N=41)	22	7	33	7	2	17	7	6	9	3	4
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=46)	34	4	30	20	8	5	13	6	2	10	1
Title VI (N=44)	26	19	34	18	5	9	8	0	5	7	1
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=48)	23	13	34	19	9	10	10	2	11	10	0
Education of Migratory Children (N=38)	25	4	18	15	11	4	11	2	6	15	0
Even Start Family Literacy (N=43)	24	2	13	8	13	4	17	14	2	29	1
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=31)	16	5	14	17	9	5	9	2	7	8	0

Few state administrators reported being influenced by program evaluation data in selecting technical assistance topics that their program would fund or directly provide to subgrantees (11 percent). Even Start was above average in this category (33 percent) most likely because subgrantees are required to conduct annual program evaluations, thereby making evaluation data readily available to state Even Start coordinators. Similarly, few state administrators made use of state student assessment data (15 percent); the highest percentages were among administrators of Eisenhower Professional Development (23 percent) and Goals 2000 (22 percent). Finally, few administrators reported that their selection of technical assistance topics was guided by goals arising from consolidated planning (19 percent).

Pooling Professional Development Funds

Pooling funds across programs can potentially improve efficiency in the provision of professional development. In 1998, the vast majority of state administrators of every program except Neglected or Delinquent encouraged districts to pool funds for professional development across federal programs (Table 28). Overall, 72 percent of all administrators did so, representing no change in the overall percentage since 1996-97. Although the percentage varied somewhat by program, the degree of variation was decidedly less than in 1996-97. Again, as was true in 1996-97, the 1998 survey data suggest that there was some correlation between state-level efforts to coordinate and collaborate and whether program managers encouraged the pooling of professional development funds. For example, those administrators who reported coordinating administrative and operational activities or consolidating their administrative funding were more often reporting encouraging pooling of professional development funds. However, where separate subgrant applications were required, pooling of funds was less likely to be encouraged.

Again, as was true in 1996-97, state administrators within a state were not consistent in the messages they sent districts about pooling funds for professional development. In many states, administrators' efforts to encourage their subgrantees to pool professional development funds with particular programs were not reciprocated by those programs' administrators—i.e., the other programs' administrators said they did not encourage their subgrantees to pool funds. In other states, administrators reported encouraging their subgrantees to pool funds with one program while that program's administrator encouraged his or her subgrantees to pool their resources with another program. Again, Title I was the program most often cited as a program with which other programs should pool their funds.

Table 28

Number of State Administrators Who Encouraged Subgrantees to Pool Their Program Funds for Professional Development with Those of Any Other Federal or State Program, by Program
(N=434)

In the past year, did any of your written or personal communications encourage subgrantees to pool [this program's] funds for professional development with those of any other federal or state program(s)?

Federally Funded Education Programs	Number of State Administrators Who Encouraged Subgrantees to Pool Their Program Funds for Professional Development with Those of Any Other Federal or State Program:
Title I, Part A (N=49)	41
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (N=48)	29
Goals 2000 (N=46)	37
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=49)	40
Title VI (N=48)	35
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	42
Education of Migratory Children (N=47)	29
Even Start Family Literacy (N=50)	39
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=47)	22
TOTAL	314

Local Perspectives on State Technical Assistance

If state administrators rely on districts to know when they need help and how to ask for it, they can only speculate as to whether they are meeting the full range of their subgrantees' technical assistance needs. In site visits to 16 districts in eight states, our interviews with local program administrators generally confirmed state managers' worst fears: states are not meeting their subgrantees' technical assistance needs. Most local administrators refer to the tremendous turnover their SEAs have experienced in the past several years and mourn the loss of institutional knowledge; some feel they are having to spend time training their state administrators to do their jobs.

> There's heavy turnover at the SEA; we're constantly dealing with different people. You can't have major improvement without the hands to get it done; you need people to get results. They can't respond as fully or as quickly because they don't have the staff.
>
> Because the SEA has seen so much turnover, there's only so much institutional knowledge from which districts [can] benefit. The SEA doesn't pay enough, turnover is great. There have been four different state Eisenhower Professional Development coordinators since I've been here, so I know more [than they do] and it takes them a while to catch up.

- Some local administrators in this state said that they did not see state program administrators as a resource to them. In fact, they perceived them to be more restrictive than the federal government and resistant to collaboration. Furthermore, the application for consolidation was seen by local administrators as illogical and a disincentive.

Local-level perspectives on state administration were not all bad: some district officials did believe their state was giving them the assistance and support they needed:

> I talk with the state program administrator every week and he has been very helpful. He has provided grant writing workshops to help leverage funds, helped me create a plan for disseminating products, encourages collaboration, and has facilitated networking around the state.

Using Federal Funds to Support State Education Reform Goals and Build Local Capacity

The vast majority of administrators reported using their program funds to support state education reform goals, and administrators' responses to a series of open-ended questions indicated that the kind of support some programs are funding is beginning to appear targeted toward the purpose of improving local capacity in support of standards-based reforms. However, the data clearly show that some programs provide more support than others, and are more likely to provide a kind of support that is more directly related to improving local-level capacity to teach to the standards and improve student achievement. That is, nearly 100 percent of the administrators for Goals 2000, TLCF, Title VI, and Eisenhower Professional Development reported that they use their program funds to support state reform goals—higher than the percentage of administrators reporting for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (74 percent), Migrant Education (79 percent), Even Start (70 percent), and Neglected or Delinquent (66 percent) (Table 29). When asked about the nature of the support they provide, administrators of Goals 2000, TLCF, Title VI, and Eisenhower Professional Development tended to speak in frank terms about standards-based assistance provided to districts, schools, and teachers:

> Eisenhower funds have been used to train teachers in the use of data from the SAT test and test interpretation in order to improve student achievement. We've done this for two years at the district level. I think this training has helped teachers to do this and identify where students need more help. (Eisenhower Professional Development)

> Goals 2000 money has helped develop an assessment for new teachers with the expectation that teachers will be able to teach reading that is coordinated with state standards. This coming year, there will be an emphasis on tying reading preparation programs and support for new teachers—especially in reading—to standards. (Goals 2000)

> We supported staff development personnel at various educational service units, directly working on the reading and writing standards, both in the development of options that were presented to the board and worked [by] teams of teachers in schools to test various instructional strategies and in the review of literature that will help teachers understand what best practices are. This summer, in conjunction with a project funded by NSF, we took the lead in organizing training and discussion related to the question: How do you take standards, adjust curriculum, then choose assessment options? (Title VI)

Administrators of some of the other programs said that while they believe their programs' funds support state reform goals, their first priority is to fulfill the needs of the populations they serve. For these programs, particularly Migrant Education, Even Start, and Neglected or Delinquent, which do not receive much administrative funding to begin with, administrators said they are usually not able to focus on issues that fall outside the specific purposes and priorities of the programs they administer. As one administrator explained, "My program can't support the development of standards or assessments because Migrant's budget is too small." Many state administrators of Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities said that their time and money have been completely absorbed by the requirement to implement the Principles of Effectiveness; the following comment was typical: "It's hard to find effective programs when you're looking at prevention. . . there are a limited number of evaluated programs available. The cost and time available to implement or evaluate is limited, and that's problematic."

Table 29

Using Federal Education Program Funds to Support State Reform Goals, by Program

(N=430)

In your estimation, are your program funds used to support state reform goals?

Federally Funded Education Programs	Number of State Administrators Reporting That They Have Used Their Program Funds to Support State Reform Goals
Title I, Part A (N=48)	44
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (N=46)	34
Goals 2000 (N=46)	45
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=49)	48
Title VI (N=47)	46
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	49
Education of Migratory Children (N=47)	37
Even Start Family Literacy (N=50)	35
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=47)	31

Federal Technical Assistance

To help states use the provisions of the new laws as effectively as possible, the U.S. Department of Education offers program administrators a range of sources of information and technical assistance. Survey data show that state program managers are rather enthusiastic about the direct support they receive from the U.S. Department of Education but are less satisfied with ED's external technical assistance support system such as the Regional Educational Laboratories or the Comprehensive Centers. Indeed, after ED, state administrators are more frequently reporting considering other states and professional associations as being "very helpful" or "helpful" in informing their understanding of federal legislative provisions affecting their programs than the Regional Educational Laboratories or Comprehensive Centers. Specifically, survey data show that the vast majority of state administrators consider written information from ED (90 percent) and other contacts with ED through conferences, workshops, online services, and the like (83 percent) to have been "very helpful" or "helpful" in informing their understanding of federal legislative provisions affecting their programs; the next most frequent responses were other states (55 percent) and professional associations (38 percent). Only about one quarter of state administrators reported that they considered the Comprehensive Centers (25 percent) or Regional Educational Laboratories (24 percent) to be "very helpful" or "helpful" (Table 30). Program by program, Title I administrators were most frequently reporting that the Regional Educational Laboratories were helpful, but they still numbered fewer than half. Title I was also the outlier with respect to the Comprehensive Centers, with 23 of the 49 state directors believing the centers were "very helpful" or "helpful"; numbers well above the average. At the other end of the spectrum, TLCF administrators were those least likely to view the centers as helpful, with only two of the 49 TLCF managers selecting this response.

Regarding the timeliness with which state administrators received information from the U.S. Department of Education about the federal legislative provisions affecting their programs, the majority of state administrators—with no significant variation by program—said the information they received was "somewhat" or "very" timely (73 percent). Among the 25 percent of respondents who reported that the information they received from ED was "somewhat" or "very" slow, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities and the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund were slightly above the average, with about one-third of respondents selecting these response options (Table 31).

Finally, when asked which sources of guidance are generally the most influential when state administrators are making decisions about program administration, the vast majority cited the U.S. Department of Education (92 percent). The next most influential source of guidance—with no significant variation by program—was "key policymakers within the SEA" (66 percent). Interestingly, more administrators cited "local districts or other subgrantees" (41 percent) as a source of guidance

Table 30

State Administrators Who Find Various Organizations and Agencies to be Helpful in Informing Their Understanding of Federal Legislative Provisions Affecting Their Program, by Program (N=431)

In the past year, how helpful have each of the following sources of information been in informing your understanding of the federal legislative provisions affecting your program?

	Number of State Administrators Reporting That the Following Organizations and Agencies Have Been "Very Helpful" or "Helpful" in Informing Their Understanding of Federal Legislative Provisions Affecting Their Program:								
Federally Funded Education Programs	Written Information from U.S. Department of Education (ED)	Other Contacts with ED	Regional Educational Laboratories	Comprehensive Centers	Eisenhower Math/Science Consortia	Professional Associations	Institutions of Higher Education	Other States	Other
Title I, Part A (N=49)	48	43	22	23	6	25	4	28	3
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (N=47)	42	37	5	11	0	11	4	19	5
Goals 2000 (N=45)	39	40	15	13	8	20	8	23	4
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=49)	40	44	15	2	4	28	16	30	6
Title VI (N=48)	35	34	9	14	7	21	4	32	5
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	43	42	15	10	20	21	16	31	4
Education of Migratory Children (N=46)	38	36	7	18	3	13	7	27	3
Even Start Family Literacy (N=50)	48	47	9	6	0	18	10	31	9
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=47)	42	34	7	9	2	8	3	17	1
TOTAL	387	357	104	106	50	165	72	238	40

Table 31

Timeliness with Which State Administrators Received Information from the U.S. Department of Education Regarding the Federal Legislative Provisions Affecting Their Program, by Program (N=430)

In the past year, how would you rate the timeliness with which you have received information from the U.S. Department of Education regarding the federal legislative provisions affecting your program?

	Number of State Administrators Reporting That the Timeliness with Which They Received Information from the U.S. Department of Education Regarding the Legislative Provisions Affecting Their Program Was:				
Federally Funded Education Programs	**Very Slow**	**Somewhat Slow**	**Somewhat Timely**	**Very Timely**	**Don't Know**
Title I, Part A (N=48)	2	9	23	14	0
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (N=47)	8	9	24	5	1
Goals 2000 (N=46)	3	3	20	19	1
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=48)	5	11	15	17	0
Title VI (N=48)	8	5	23	11	1
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	3	9	26	12	0
Education of Migratory Children (N=47)	4	4	22	16	1
Even Start Family Literacy (N=50)	3	8	24	13	2
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=46)	4	10	23	9	0
TOTAL	40	68	200	116	6

than "other state administrators of federal programs within the state" (36 percent) or "state administrators of federal programs in other states" (36 percent), suggesting that state administrators are paying attention to the particular needs of local school districts when they make decisions about program administration, rather than focusing on what other state administrators or other states do (Table 32).

Summary: Positive Steps, Insufficient Capacity

As was true in 1996-97, agency downsizing in many SEAs continued to adversely affect the technical assistance capacity in federal programs, and state administrators continued to rely on districts to know when they need help and how to ask for it.

A positive development in 1998 was that program administrators showed greater coordination in the content of the technical assistance they provided than in 1996-97, and much of that content focused on a standards-based reform agenda. Indeed, the vast majority of administrators reported using their program funds to support state education reform goals, and administrators' responses to a series of open-ended questions indicated that the kind of support some programs are funding is focused on improving local capacity in support of standards-based reforms.

However, despite these developments, with the exception of the Even Start program, few state administrators reported being influenced by program evaluation data in selecting technical assistance topics that their program would fund or directly provide to subgrantees. Most disturbingly, our interviews with local program administrators generally confirmed state managers' fears: at least in this small sample of districts from around the country, states are not meeting their subgrantees' technical assistance needs.

Table 32

Sources of Guidance That State Administrators Report Are the Most Influential Regarding Decisions About Program Administration, by Program
(N=432)

When you are making decisions about how to administer [this program], which of the following sources of guidance are generally the most influential?

	Number of State Administrators Reporting That the Following Sources of Guidance Are the Most Influential:						
Federally Funded Education Programs	**U.S. Department of Education**	**Key Policymakers in the SEA**	**Other State Administrators of Federal Programs in This State**	**State Administrators of Federal Programs in Other States**	**Multi-State Providers of Technical Assistance**	**Local Districts or Other Subgrantees**	**Other**
Title I, Part A (N=49)	48	33	15	19	10	18	1
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (N=47)	46	30	19	12	7	24	3
Goals 2000 (N=46)	36	34	18	2	7	26	7
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=48)	43	35	13	12	4	22	8
Title VI (N=48)	41	29	26	25	4	13	2
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	49	37	27	15	3	15	2
Education of Migratory Children (N=47)	45	29	11	27	7	20	2
Even Start Family Literacy (N=50)	45	27	15	27	6	20	5
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=47)	46	32	13	16	6	17	2

V. Performance Indicators: Are States Collecting and Using Indicators Data to Inform Program Performance?

Findings from the baseline study showed that program performance indicators were not a particularly common means by which program administrators assessed and improved program success. Since that study was conducted, the U.S. Department of Education has developed—as mandated under the Government Performance and Results Act—a set of program performance indicators intended to inform Congress, the Department, and the nation about the effectiveness of federal elementary and secondary programs. In 1998, state administrators were again asked whether they had developed their own set of program performance indicators and how those indicators were used. In addition, they were asked whether they: (1) were aware of the program performance indicators developed by the U.S. Department of Education and (2) collected and used the federal performance indicator data.

State-Developed Program Performance Indicators

Program performance indicators appear to be on the rise among federally funded programs. In 1998, 55 percent of state administrators reported that their program either had developed (26 percent) or was in the process of developing (29 percent) performance indicators; in 1996-97, the overall percentage was just 41 percent. Performance indicators were found in significant majorities in state offices administering Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (85 percent) and Eisenhower Professional Development (84 percent). About half the administrators of TLCF reported having developed or being in the process of developing performance indicators, and slightly less than half of the offices administering Title I, Even Start, Title VI, and Neglected or Delinquent programs reported doing so. Migrant Education administrators posted the lowest numbers, with only 34 percent of state administrators reporting having or being in the process of developing performance indicators (Table 33).

Among the 26 percent of state administrators who reported having already developed—as opposed to being in the process of developing—performance indicators, most reported that they were using the indicators to inform their work and to plan and coordinate across programs. Specifically, state administrators reported using the indicators to: (1) help program staff focus on program goals and objectives (82 percent), (2) provide program outcome data for administrative planning (74 percent), (3) monitor the progress of local programs or subgrantees (72 percent), and (4) provide state and local administrators with a common language for defining program results (67 percent) (Table 34).

Table 33

State Administrators Reporting That Their Program Has Developed Performance Indicators, by Program (N=385)

Has this program developed performance indicators?

Federally Funded Education Programs	Number of State Administrators Reporting That Their Program *HAS DEVELOPED* Performance Indicators	Number of State Administrators Reporting That Their Program *IS DEVELOPING* Performance Indicators
Title I, Part A (N=47)	8	15
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (N=47)	28	12
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=50)	5	21
Title VI (N=48)	6	14
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	30	12
Education of Migratory Children (N=47)	6	10
Even Start Family Literacy (N=49)	10	14
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=47)	7	12
TOTAL	100	110

Table 34

State Administrators Reporting on How They Use Their Program Performance Indicators, by Program
(N=99)

If your program has developed program performance indicators, how do you and your colleagues in this program office use them?

	Number of State Administrators Reporting That They Use Program Performance Indicators to:								
Federally Funded Education Programs	**Provide State and Local Administrators with a Common Language for Defining Program Results**	**Help Program Staff Focus on Program Goals and Objectives**	**Provide Program Outcome Data for Administrative Planning**	**Enable This Program to Engage in Cross-Program Coordination**	**Monitor the Progress of Local Programs or Subgrantees**	**Provide Information about Existing or Potential Problems**	**Keep the State Board of Education or Legislature Informed about the Program's Progress**	**Provide Consumer-Oriented Information about Program Performance**	**Other**
Title I, Part A (N=9)	6	6	5	2	6	4	5	5	1
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (N=27)	19	24	25	11	19	18	12	11	1
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=5)	4	4	3	2	3	3	3	2	1
Title VI (N=6)	2	2	2	3	4	0	1	2	0
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=29)	16	24	17	14	20	16	6	7	2
Education of Migratory Children (N=6)	5	5	4	2	5	2	1	2	0
Even Start Family Literacy (N=10)	8	10	10	8	8	7	3	5	2
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=7)	6	6	7	1	6	2	3	2	0
TOTAL	66	81	73	43	71	52	34	36	7

Federal Program Performance Indicators

Federal program administrators responded to questions about their awareness of the existence of federal program performance indicators that the U.S. Department of Education developed in response to the Government Performance and Results Act. In particular, administrators were asked about the extent to which they collect data from local school districts on selected indicators, and (in cases where data are collected) how this information is used. While some programmatic differences were identified, no state-level patterns emerged. That is, consistent responses were not found across all programs in any of the states. The following discussion focuses first on trends found across all respondents and then moves to program-specific analyses of data in each of the following areas: awareness of performance indicators, data collection efforts, uses of program performance indicator data, and, for programs that did not collect data, reasons why these data were not collected.

Overall, about 62 percent of all state administrators reported being aware of the fact that the U.S. Department of Education had developed a set of performance indicators for their respective programs. The numbers of state administrators expressing awareness, however, did vary significantly by program. That is, administrators of Eisenhower Professional Development (98 percent), Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (85 percent), and the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (79 percent) were well above average in terms of knowing about the existence of the federal program performance indicators; conversely, administrators of Migrant Education (38 percent), Goals 2000 (35 percent), and Neglected or Delinquent programs (34 percent) were well below the average (Table 35). Some of this variation can be explained by the fact that at the time the survey was administered, ED had only recently transmitted the indicators to the states. It is likely that information about the indicators had not yet filtered down to the relevant program managers.

Of the 267 program administrators who were aware of the federal program performance indicators, 217 or 81 percent also collected some or all data on them. As illustrated in Table 36, administrators of Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities and the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund reported both being aware of and collecting these data more than any other program (100 percent and 92 percent of administrators collected data, respectively).

Of the 217 program administrators who collected some or all data related to the federal program performance indicators, 209 responded to questions about the corrective actions they take when local school districts fail to submit these data to the state. The survey data show that most administrators appeared to value the indicators as a source of information and to be willing to ensure that such data are provided. That is, most of the 209 administrators (77 percent) reported initiating some type of corrective action against local school districts that fail to submit the data to the state.

Table 35

State Administrators Reporting That They Are Aware of the U.S. Department of Education's Program Performance Indicators, by Program (N=429)

In response to the requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act, the U.S. Department of Education (ED) has developed a set of performance indicators for [your] program. Are you aware of the indicators?

Federally Funded Education Programs	Number of State Administrators
Title I, Part A (N=47)	28
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (N=48)	41
Goals 2000 (N=46)	16
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=48)	38
Title VI (N=48)	31
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	49
Education of Migratory Children (N=47)	18
Even Start Family Literacy (N=48)	30
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=47)	16
TOTAL	267

Table 36

State Administrators Reporting That They Collect Program Performance Indicator Data, by Program

(N=267)

To assist in updating and improving ED's performance indicators, we are attempting to gauge the extent to which the following information is collected by your state. Please provide your best estimates as to the availability of the following information.

Federally Funded Education Programs	**Number of State Administrators That Collect Data from All Districts, or from a Sample of Districts on At Least One Indicator**
Title I, Part A (N=28)	21
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (N=41)	41
Goals 2000 (N=16)	14
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=38)	35
Title VI (N=31)	24
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=49)	31
Education of Migratory Children (N=18)	14
Even Start Family Literacy (N=30)	24
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=16)	13
TOTAL	217

Of the 161 state administrators who reported initiating corrective action against school districts that fail to submit data related to the performance indicators, most said they do so by: (1) assisting local school districts in developing a plan to collect the data (63 percent), (2) withholding program funds (43 percent), or (3) other means (16 percent) (Table 37).

Of the 217 program administrators who collect some or all data related to the federal program performance indicators, most reported using these data for a variety of purposes. That is, most administrators reported using the data to report to federal officials (81 percent). In addition, administrators use these data to: (1) identify priorities for state-level technical assistance (74 percent), (2) identify districts and schools for which technical assistance is needed (73 percent), (3) report to state officials (67 percent), and (4) use in some other manner (10 percent) (Table 38).

Finally, of the 97 program administrators who are aware of the federal program performance indicators but do not collect the data, many did report that it would be possible to collect these data in the future. That is, of the 66 program administrators who responded to questions about the feasibility of collecting these data in the future, 44 (67 percent) said that it would be possible to collect these data but with some difficulty, and 20 (30 percent) stated that they could collect these data fairly easily. Only 16 program administrators (24 percent) stated that it would be extremely difficult to collect this information, and five (8 percent) stated that it would be inappropriate to do so.

Program-Specific Uses of Federal Performance Indicators Data

The extent to which program administrators collected and used federal performance indicators data appeared to vary more by the type of indicator (each program has its own set of indicators) than by program.

Title I. Twenty-eight of the 47 Title I program administrators reported that they were aware of the federal performance indicators. Of these, 21 administrators reported collecting data on at least one of the four indicators and five collected data on all four indicators: Research-based Curriculum and Instruction (Indicator 2.3), Qualified Teacher Aides (Indicator 2.6), Accountability: Intervention (Indicator 4.3a), and Accountability: Assistance (Indicator 4.3b). Furthermore, they collected data on the accountability indicators (Indicators 4.3a and 4.3b) approximately twice as frequently as they collected data on Research-based Curriculum and Instruction or on Teacher Aides (Indicators 2.3 and 2.6, respectively). That is, out of 27 program administrators, 20 collected data on Accountability: Assistance; 19 administrators collected data on Accountability: Intervention; 10 administrators collected data on Qualified Teacher Aides; and 8 administrators collected data on Research-based Curriculum and Instruction. Finally, most administrators who collected these data collected them from all districts

Table 37

Ways in Which States Initiate Corrective Action Against Local School Districts That Fail to Submit Data to the State on the Indicators for Which Data Have Been Requested or Required (N=209)

[Where data are collected] In which of the following ways, if any, does your state initiate corrective action against local school districts that fail to submit data to the state on the indicators for which data have been requested and/or required?

	Number of State Administrators Reporting That Their State Initiates Corrective Action Against School Districts by:				
Federally Funded Education Programs	**Don't Know**	**Assisting Local School Districts in Developing a Plan to Collect the Data**	**Withholding Program Funds**	**Other Means**	**Number of State Administrators Reporting That Their State DOES NOT Initiate Corrective Action Against Local School Districts**
Title I, Part A (N=20)	0	7	5	3	6
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (N=40)	1	23	18	7	6
Goals 2000 (N=14)	0	7	7	1	3
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=34)	0	16	12	4	9
Title VI (N=14)	0	8	5	3	7
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=34)	1	13	10	3	7
Education of Migratory Children (N=14)	0	8	3	1	4
Even Start Family Literacy (N=24)	0	14	5	4	3
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=11)	1	6	4	0	3
TOTAL	3	102	69	26	48

Table 38

Ways in Which States Use Federal Program Performance Indicator Data (N=217)

[Where data are collected] If your state collects data on any of the indicators listed in Question 21, how is the information used?

	Number of State Administrators Reporting That They Use Program Performance Indicator Data from At Least One Indicator to:				
Federally Funded Education Programs	**Identify Districts and Schools for which Technical Assistance is Needed**	**Report to State Officials**	**Report to Federal Officials**	**Identify Priorities for State-level Technical Assistance**	**Other**
Title I, Part A (N=21)	19	13	15	16	3
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (N=41)	32	32	39	31	1
Goals 2000 (N=14)	11	13	9	13	1
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (N=35)	25	28	28	22	3
Title VI (N=23)	9	9	17	12	6
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=31)	19	15	28	23	3
Education of Migratory Children (N=14)	11	9	11	12	1
Even Start Family Literacy (N=23)	22	16	17	21	3
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=13)	8	8	10	9	0
TOTAL	156	143	174	159	21

receiving program funds, rather than from a sample of districts. This held true for each of the four indicators--Accountability: Assistance (16 out of 20 administrators); Accountability: Intervention (14 out of 19 administrators); Qualified Teacher Aides (9 out of 10 administrators); and Research-based Approaches to Improving Curriculum and Instruction (6 out of 8 administrators) (Table 39).

Most Title I program administrators who collect performance indicator data reported taking some type of corrective action when LEAs failed to submit program performance indicator data. Their diligence in encouraging districts to collect these data may indicate that they are of some use to program administrators. Of the 21 program administrators who collected federal performance indicator data, 14 reported taking some form of corrective action against districts that fail to submit data to the state, including: assisting local school districts in developing a plan to collect data (7 administrators), withholding program funds (5 administrators), or taking some other form of corrective action (3 administrators). Only six administrators said that they do not take any form of corrective action against districts that fail to submit data to them, and one administrator did not respond to this question.

Most Title I program administrators reported using the performance indicator data that they collect for a variety of purposes, including: identifying schools and districts for which technical assistance is needed (19 administrators); identifying priorities for state-level technical assistance (16 administrators); reporting to federal officials (15 administrators); and reporting to state officials (13 administrators). Indicator by indicator, however, it appears that more states collect and use the data for the accountability indicators (Indicators 4.3a and 4.3b) than other indicators and that they use these data for purposes of identifying technical assistance needs and priorities (Table 40).

Of the 22 program administrators who reported that they do not collect data on at least one program performance indicator or that they do not know whether they collect these data, 10 administrators predicted how difficult it would be to collect data on at least one indicator in the future. Six administrators indicated that it would be possible to collect these data, but with some difficulty; five stated that it would be extremely difficult to collect and report these data; three said that they could collect and report program performance data fairly easily; and one had no knowledge.

Even Start. Thirty of the 48 Even Start program administrators surveyed indicated that they were aware of the federal program performance indicators. Of these, 24 reported collecting data on at least one program performance indicator and 20 collected data on all three of the indicators included in the surveys: Parenting Skills (Indicator 1.4), Adult Literacy Achievement (Indicator 1.1), and Children's Language Development and Reading Readiness (Indicator 1.3).

Table 39

Extent to Which Title I Program Administrators Collect Data on Federal Program Performance Indicators

(N=27)

To assist in updating and improving ED's performance indicators, we are attempting to gauge the extent to which the following information is currently collected by your state. Please provide your best estimate as to the availability of the following information. SEA Currently Collects Data?

	SEA Currently Collects Data?				
Indicator	**Yes, from ALL districts receiving program funds**	**Yes, from a sample of districts**	**No**	**Don't Know**	**Other**
2.3: Research-based curriculum and instruction. The proportion of schools using comprehensive, research-based approaches to improve curriculum and instruction.	6	2	13	5	1
2.6: Qualified teacher aides. The percent of districts providing support for the educational improvement of paraprofessionals/teacher aides will increase.	9	1	10	5	0
4.3a: Accountability: intervention. States and districts provide assistance to schools not making progress (through school support teams and other sources).	14	5	5	1	2
4.3b: Accountability: assistance. States and districts will take appropriate action with schools that consistently fail.	16	4	4	1	2

Table 40

Title I Program Administrators' Use of Federal Program Performance Indicator Data

[Where data are collected] If your state collects data on any of the performance indicators listed, how is the information used?

How Data Are Used	Indicator 2.3 (N=9)	Indicator 2.6 (N=10)	Indicator 4.3a (N=19)	Indicator 4.3b (N=20)
To identify districts and schools for which technical assistance is needed	7	5	17	17
To report to state officials	4	3	10	10
To report to federal officials	5	7	10	11
To identify priorities for state level technical assistance	6	4	14	14
Other	1	1	2	2

In comparison to Title I, there was less variation in the number of Even Start administrators who reported collecting data on the federal program performance indicators: Even Start administrators collected data on each indicator nearly equally (Table 41). Specifically, 24 administrators reported collecting data on Parenting Skills, 22 administrators collected data on Adult Literacy Achievement, and 21 administrators collected data on Children's Language Development and Reading Readiness. In addition, most of the Even Start administrators reported that they collect indicators data from all districts receiving program funds rather than from a sample of districts. More specifically, 21 administrators collect data from all districts for both Adult Literacy Achievement (Indicator 1.1) and Parenting Skills (Indicator 1.4) and 19 administrators collect data from all districts on Children's Language Development and Reading Readiness (Indicator 1.3).

Even Start program administrators also seem to value program performance indicator data and take corrective action when data are not submitted to the state. That is, 18 of the 24 administrators who collect data on at least one indicator reported taking some sort of corrective action against districts. Of these, 14 indicated that they work with LEAs to develop a data collection plan and five said that they withhold program funds.

As with Title I, Even Start program administrators most frequently reported using performance indicator data to inform their technical assistance activities. That is, more Even Start administrators reported using the indicators data to identify schools and districts for which technical assistance is needed or to identify priorities for state-level technical assistance than using them to report to state or federal officials. By comparison, fewer Even Start administrators reported using performance indicator data for purposes of reporting to state and federal officials: 16 administrators for indicator 1.1, 15 administrators for indicator 1.4, and 14 administrators for indicator 1.3 (Table 42).

Ten Even Start program administrators said that they do not collect or do not know if they collect data on at least one program performance indicator, and seven predicted how difficult it would be to collect these data in the future. The vast majority of these administrators said that they could "fairly easily" or "possibly" collect performance indicator data for all three indicators.

Migrant Education. Eighteen of the 47 Migrant Education program administrators surveyed said that they were aware of the federal program performance indicators, and 14 reported collecting data on at least one indicator. Specifically, 14 administrators reported collecting data on Program Coordination (Indicator 3.4) and 10 collect data on Inter- and Intrastate Coordination (Indicator 3.1). For each of these indicators, most administrators reported collecting data from all districts receiving program funds rather than from a sample of districts. That is, 12 of the 14 administrators collected data from all districts on Program Coordination (Indicator 3.4) and eight administrators did so on Inter-

Table 41

Extent to Which Even Start Program Administrators Collect Data on Performance Indicators
(N = 30)

To assist in updating and improving ED's performance indicators, we are attempting to gauge the extent to which the following information is currently collected by your state. Please provide your best estimate as to the availability of the following information. SEA Currently Collects Data?

	SEA Currently Collects Data?				
Indicator	Yes, from ALL districts receiving program funds	Yes, from a sample of districts	No	Don't Know	Other
1.1: Adult literacy achievement. By fall 2001, 40 percent of Even Start adults will achieve significant learning gains on measures of math skills and 30 percent of adults will achieve such gains on measures of reading skills.	21	1	8	0	0
1.3: Children's language development and reading readiness. By fall 2001, 60 percent of Even Start children will attain significant gains on measures of language development and reading readiness.	19	2	9	0	0
1.4: Parenting skills. Increasing percentages of parents will show significant gains on measures of parenting skills, knowledge, and expectations for their children.	21	3	6	0	0

Table 42

Even Start Program Administrators' Use of Federal Program Performance Indicator Data

[Where data are collected] If your state collects data on any of the performance indicators listed, how is the information used?

How Data Are Used	Indicator 1.1 (N=22)	Indicator 1.3 (N=21)	Indicator 1.4 (N=24)
To identify districts and schools for which technical assistance is needed	20	19	21
To report to state officials	16	14	15
To report to federal officials	16	14	15
To identify priorities for state-level technical assistance	20	19	20
Other	3	2	3

and Intrastate Coordination (Indicator 3.1) from all districts and 12 administrators did so for program coordination (Table 43).

Of the 14 Migrant Education program administrators who collect performance indicator data, most (10 administrators) reported taking some form of corrective action against those LEAs that failed to submit performance indicator data to the state. As with Even Start and Title I, the most frequently reported corrective action that Migrant Education program administrators take is assisting local school districts to develop a data collection plan (8 administrators). Another corrective action that Migrant Education administrators reported taking is withholding program funds (3 administrators).

Most program administrators' used the indicators data (both Inter- and Intrastate Coordination and Program Coordination) to report to federal officials (9 and 10 administrators, respectively) and to identify priorities for state-level technical assistance (9 and 12 administrators, respectively) (Table 44).

Seven Migrant Education program administrators said that they do not collect or do not know if they collect data on at least one program performance indicator, and five predicted how difficult it would be to collect these data in the future. Four administrators indicated that it would be possible to collect and report data for Indicator 3.1 but with some difficulty.

Neglected or Delinquent Youth. Sixteen of the 47 administrators of the Neglected or Delinquent program who responded to the survey said they were aware of federal program performance indicators. Of these, 13 collected data on at least one performance indicator and seven collected data on all three indicators: Academic Achievement (Indicator 1.1), Institution-wide Programs (Indicator 2.1), and Innovative Transition Programs (Indicator 2.2). Indicator by indicator, administrators of the Neglected or Delinquent program reported collecting data on Academic Achievement and Institution-wide Programs more frequently than on Innovative Transition Programs. Of the 16 administrators who were aware of the performance indicators, 11 reported that they collect data on Academic Achievement and Institution-wide Programs, and eight program administrators said that they collect data on Innovative Transition Programs, as shown in Table 45. This variation in data collection activity may reflect the degree of difficulty administrators face in defining and collecting indicators data. That is, Academic Achievement and Institution-wide Programs may be more easily defined and measured than Innovative Transition Programs.

As was the case with other federal programs, many state administrators of the Neglected or Delinquent programs took some form of corrective action against districts that failed to submit program performance indicator data to the state. As is the case with many other programs, more administrators who took corrective action used a collaborative approach to gather these data (i.e., assisting local

Table 43

Extent to Which Migrant Education Program Administrators Collect Data on Federal Program Performance Indicators
(N=18)

To assist in updating and improving ED's performance indicators, we are attempting to gauge the extent to which the following information is currently collected by your state. Please provide your best estimate as to the availability of the following information. SEA Currently Collects Data?

	SEA Currently Collects Data?				
Indicator	Yes, from ALL districts receiving program funds	Yes, from a sample of districts	No	Don't Know	Other
3.1: Inter- and instrastate coordination. SEAs and LEAs will demonstrate increased interstate and intrastate coordination to improve educational continuity for migrant students. Measures of coordination include joint products resulting from these formal agreements, meetings, or conferences to promote coordination; coordinated guidance to grantees; and joint planning by local staff from all available programs.	8	2	6	1	1
3.4: Program coordination. Federal, SEA, and LEA staff working with Title I, Part A and Part C, and other federally funded programs, will demonstrate increasing levels of substantive collaboration to meet the unmet needs of migrant children.	12	2	3	0	1

Table 44

Migrant Program Administrators' Use of Federal Program Performance Indicator Data

[Where data are collected] If your state collects data on any of the performance indicators listed, how is the information used?

How Data Are Used	Indicator 3.1 (N=10)	Indicator 3.4 (N=14)
To identify districts and schools for which technical assistance is needed	7	11
To report to state officials	7	8
To report to federal officials	9	10
To identify priorities for state-level technical assistance	9	12
Other	0	1

Table 45

Extent to Which Administrators for the Neglected or Delinquent Program Collect Data on Federal Program Performance Indicators
(N=16)

To assist in updating and improving ED's performance indicators, we are attempting to gauge the extent to which the following information is currently collected by your state. Please provide your best estimate as to the availability of the following information. SEA Currently Collects Data?

	SEA Currently Collects Data?				
Indicator	Yes, from ALL districts receiving program funds	Yes, from a sample of districts	No	Don't Know	Other
1.1: Academic achievement. The number of N, D, and at-risk children and youth who will progress toward a high school diploma or GED while institutionalized will increase	9	2	4	1	0
2.1: Institution-wide programs. The number of institutions that will operate institution-wide programs integrating other federal and state programs to improve curriculum and instruction across the institution will increase	10	1	4	0	0
2.2: Innovative transition programs. State and local programs will develop innovative strategies that help institutionalized students make a successful transition from an institution back to the community, either to further their education or to obtain employment.	5	3	7	1	0

school districts to write a data collection plan, used in six states) than used stronger sanctions (i.e., withholding program funds, done in four states).

Although equal numbers of state administrators collected data on Academic Achievement and Institution-wide Programs (8 administrators), more administrators reported using data on Academic Achievement for such purposes as: reporting to state officials, identifying districts and schools for which technical assistance is needed, and identifying priorities for state-level technical assistance. Six administrators used these data to identify priorities for technical assistance; five administrators each used institution-wide data to report to state officials and to identify schools and districts that need technical assistance (Table 46).

Of the nine Neglected or Delinquent program administrators who reported that they do not collect or do not know if they collect data on at least one program performance indicator, six responded to questions about how difficult it would be to collect these data in the future. Most program administrators (five for academic achievement, two for institution-wide programs, and five for innovative transition programs) indicated that it would be possible to collect these data in the future. However, two administrators said that it would be inappropriate to collect data on institution-wide programs (Indicator 2.1).

Title II. The Eisenhower Professional Development Program had the highest proportion of state administrators (49 out of 50 administrators) who reported that they are aware of the Department of Education's program performance indicators. Of these, 31 administrators reported collecting data on at least one of the performance indicators that we asked about and 19 collected data on all three performance indicators: Duration (Indicator 3.2), Teachers' Skills and Classroom Instruction (Indicator 1.1), and High Poverty Schools (Indicator 4.1).

Indicator by indicator, administrators of the Eisenhower Professional Development Program most frequently reported collecting data on the duration and impact of subgrantee activities, rather than on the population served. As shown in Table 47, out of 49 administrators, 28 administrators collected data on the duration of professional development programs; 24 collected data on teachers' skills and classroom instruction; and 22 gathered data on the degree to which Title II activities are offered to teachers in high-poverty schools.

Of the 31 program administrators who reported collecting performance indicator data, 23 said they used some type of sanction when local school districts failed to submit indicator data to them. Of these, 13 said they assisted local school districts to write a data collection plan, 10 withheld program funds, and three used some other form of action.

Table 46

Neglected or Delinquent Program Administrators' Use of Federal Program Performance Indicator Data

[Where data are collected] If your state collects data on any of the performance indicators listed, how is the information used?

How Data Are Used	Indicator 1.1 (N=11)	Indicator 2.1 (N=11)	Indicator 2.2 (N=8)
To identify districts and schools for which technical assistance is needed	8	5	4
To report to state officials	8	5	6
To report to federal officials	7	7	4
To identify priorities for state-level technical assistance	8	6	5
Other	0	0	0

Table 47

Extent to Which Administrators of the Eisenhower Professional Development Program Collect Data on Federal Program Performance Indicators

(N=49)

To assist in updating and improving ED's performance indicators, we are attempting to gauge the extent to which the following information is currently collected by your state. Please provide your best estimate as to the availability of the following information. SEA Currently Collects Data?

	SEA Currently Collects Data?				
Indicator	Yes, from ALL districts receiving program funds	Yes, from a sample of districts	No	Don't Know	Other
1.1: Teachers' skills and classroom instruction. By 1998, over 50% of a sample of teachers will show evidence that participation in Eisenhower-assisted professional development has resulted in improvement in their knowledge and skills, and by 1999 in an improvement in classroom instruction.	17	7	23	0	2
3.2: Duration. By 1998, 35% of teachers participation in district-level Eisenhower assisted activities will participate in activities that are a component of professional development that extends over the school year; by 2000, over 50% will.	23	5	16	2	3
4.1: High-poverty schools. The proportion of teachers participating in Eisenhower-assisted activities who teach in high-poverty schools will exceed the proportion of the national teacher pool who teach in high-poverty schools.	19	3	22	3	2

Most administrators of the Eisenhower Professional Development Program used performance indicator data in similar ways. For example, administrators reported using performance indicator data to report to federal officials (23 administrators for Indicator 1.1, 26 administrators for Indicator 3.2, and 20 administrators for Indicator 4.1). Administrators also used specific indicators to inform a variety of administrative activities. For example, Teachers' Skill and Classroom Instruction (Indicator 1.1) was also used to: identify priorities for state-level technical assistance (19 administrators), identify districts and schools for which technical assistance is needed (14 administrators), and report to state officials (13 administrators). As shown in Table 48, similar results were found for Duration (Indicator 3.2) and High-poverty Schools (Indicator 4.1).

Eisenhower Professional Development program administrators were less optimistic about their ability to collect data on Teachers' Skill and Classroom Instruction (Indicator 1.1) than about collection of data on Duration (Indicator 3.2) or High-poverty Schools (Indicator 4.1). That is, only 12 out of 21 program administrators said that it would be possible to collect data on Indicator 1.1, compared to 12 out of 15 administrators for Indicator 3.2 and 18 out of 23 administrators for Indicator 4.1 (Table 49). This may reflect the difficulty of assessing the impact of professional development on instructional practice. In comparison, duration of professional development activities and the demographics of the schools served are much easier to measure.

Technology Literacy Challenge Fund. Thirty-eight of the 48 Technology Literacy Challenge Fund program administrators surveyed were aware of the federal program performance indicators. Of these, 35 collected data on at least one indicator, and 27 collected data on both indicators: Staff Training (Indicator 3.3) and Access in High-poverty Schools (Indicator 4.2). As shown in Table 50, slightly more administrators collected data on Staff Training (32 administrators) than on Access in High-poverty Schools (29 administrators). Regarding the scope of data collection activities, 29 administrators collected data from all districts receiving program funds for staff training and 26 administrators did so for access in high-poverty schools. Three administrators collected data from a sample of districts for both indicators.

Of 35 administrators who collect indicators data, 25 reported using some form of corrective action against local school districts that fail to submit indicators data to the state. Specifically, 16 administrators reported assisting local school districts to write a data collection plan, 12 withheld program funds, and four used some other form of corrective action.

Program administrators most frequently used performance indicators data to report to state officials, both for Staff Training (27 administrators) and Access in High-poverty Schools (25 administrators). Most administrators used data for both indicators to: report to federal officials,

Table 48

Eisenhower Professional Development Program Administrators' Use of Federal Program Performance Indicator Data

[Where data are collected] If your state collects data on any of the performance indicators listed, how is the information used?

How Data Are Used	Indicator 1.1 (N=25)	Indicator 3.2 (N=29)	Indicator 4.1 (N=22)
To identify districts and schools for which technical assistance is needed	14	16	13
To report to state officials	13	14	11
To report to federal officials	23	26	20
To identify priorities for state-level technical assistance	19	21	15
Other	3	3	3

Table 49

Degree of Difficulty Eisenhower Professional Development Program Administrators Predict in Collecting Federal Program Performance Indicator Data

[Where data are NOT collected] If you are not collecting data on any or all of the indicators listed, how difficult would it be to start? Please indicate the extent to which data are available from districts for each of the indicators listed.

Level of Difficulty in Collecting Data	Indicator 1.1 (N=21)	Indicator 3.2 (N=15)	Indicator 4.1 (N=23)
Could collect from districts and report fairly easily	1	2	4
Possible to collect from districts and report, but with some difficulty	11	10	14
Extremely difficult to collect and report	7	3	5
Not appropriate	1	0	0
Don't know	1	0	0

Table 50

Extent to Which TLCF Program Administrators Collect Data on Federal Program Performance Indicators
(N=38)

To assist in updating and improving ED's performance indicators, we are attempting to gauge the extent to which the following information is currently collected by your state. Please provide your best estimate as to the availability of the following information. SEA Currently Collects Data?

	SEA Currently Collects Data?				
Indicator	Yes, from ALL Districts receiving program funds	Yes, from a sample of districts	No	Don't Know	Other
3.3: Staff training. Increasing proportions of practicing and prospective teachers, school administrators, and school librarians will receive professional development that enables them to effectively use education technology to help students learn.	29	3	5	1	0
4.2: Access in high-poverty schools. The access to education technology in high-poverty schools will be comparable to that in other schools.	26	3	4	2	3

identify districts and schools for which technical assistance is needed, and identify priorities for state-level technical assistance (Table 51).

Nine administrators of the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund reported that they do not collect data or do not know whether they collect data on at least one program performance indicator. Of these, four responded to questions about how difficult it would be to collect these data in the future. One program administrator said that she could fairly easily collect data and report on Staff Training, and two said that they could possibly collect these data, but with some difficulty. Program administrators were slightly less optimistic about their ability to collect data on Access in High-poverty Schools: they said that they could possibly collect these data, but with some difficulty (three administrators), or that it was not appropriate to collect these data (one administrator).

Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities. The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities program had the highest rate of federal program indicators data collection out of all of the nine federal programs included in this study. Forty-one out of 48 administrators reported being aware of the federal program performance indicators and all 41 administrators reported collecting data on Gun-Free Schools Act Notification and Expulsions (Indicator 6.1); 39 administrators collected data on Approval of LEA Applications (Indicator 8.3) (Table 52).

The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities program also showed the highest numbers of administrators reporting taking corrective action when local districts fail to submit program performance indicator data. Out of the 41 administrators who collect program performance data, 34 administrators reported using some form of corrective action against local school districts. Of those, 23 administrators reported assisting local school districts in writing a data collection plan, 18 withheld program funds, and seven indicated that they use some other form of corrective action.

Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities program administrators also seem to target their use of performance indicator data, depending on the topic of the indicator. That is, as shown in Table 53, Gun-Free Schools Act Notification and Expulsions data were used most frequently for reporting to federal (39 administrators) and state (31 administrators) officials. By contrast, approval of local education agency (LEA) applications (Indicator 8.3) was used most frequently to identify districts and schools for which technical assistance is needed (30 administrators), to identify priorities for state-level technical assistance, and for federal reporting (29 administrators each).

Title VI. Administrators of the Title VI program were asked about only one performance indicator: Reform Efforts (Indicator 1.1). Of the 48 Title VI program administrators surveyed, 31 indicated that they are aware of the Department's program performance indicators. Twenty-four administrators indicated that they collect data on the federal performance indicator: 20 said that they

Table 51

TLCF Program Administrators' Use of Federal Program Performance Indicator Data

[Where data are collected] If your state collects data on any of the performance indicators listed, how is the information used?

How Data Are Used	Indicator 3.3 (N = 32)	Indicator 4.2 (N = 32)
To identify districts and schools for which technical assistance is needed	21	23
To report to state officials	27	25
To report to federal officials	26	25
To identify priorities for state-level technical assistance	20	20
Other	1	3

Table 52

Extent to Which Administrators for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Program Collect Data on Federal Program Performance Indicators
(N=41)

To assist in updating and improving ED's performance indicators, we are attempting to gauge the extent to which the following information is currently collected by your state. Please provide your best estimate as to the availability of the following information. SEA Currently Collects Data?

	SEA Currently Collects Data?				
Indicator	Yes, from ALL districts receiving program funds	Yes, from a sample of districts	No	Don't Know	Other
6.1: Gun-Free Schools Act notification and expulsions. By 1998, all LEAs receiving ESEA funds will have policies requiring the expulsion of students who bring firearms to school and requiring notification of law enforcement.	41	0	0	0	0
8.3: Approval of LEA applications. All states will use performance indicators to make decisions regarding approval of LEA applications for funding. [LEAs are required to have performance indicators (called "measurable goals & objectives" in the statute) in their applications/plans]	39	0	0	2	0

Table 53

Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Program Administrators' Use of Federal Program Performance Indicator Data

[Where data are collected] If your state collects data on any of the performance indicators listed, how is the information used?

How Data Are Used	Indicator 6.1 (N=41)	Indicator 8.3 (N=39)
To identify districts and schools for which technical assistance is needed	16	30
To report to state officials	31	20
To report to federal officials	39	29
To identify priorities for state-level technical assistance	17	29
Other	1	0

collect these data from all districts receiving program funds; four collect data from a sample of districts (Table 54).

Data for Indicator 1.1 do seem to be important to Title VI programs, as two-thirds of program administrators, or 14 out of the 21 administrators who responded to the question about corrective actions, took some form of corrective action when LEAs failed to submit program performance indicator data to them. Of these, eight assisted local school districts in writing a data collection plan, five withheld program funds, and three indicated that they used some other form of corrective action.

Of the 23 program administrators who responded to questions about how they use the indicators data, most (17 administrators) said they use the data for the same purposes as other federal programs, which are for reporting to federal officials. In addition, 12 administrators report using the indicators data to identify priorities for state-level technical assistance; nine use the data to identify districts and schools for which technical assistance is needed and to report to state officials; and six use them for some other purpose (Table 55).

For those states that have not collected performance indicator data thus far, collecting it in the future seems feasible. Six Title VI program administrators answered questions about how difficult it would be to collect these data in the future. Of these, five administrators indicated that it would be possible to collect and report these data. Specifically, three indicated that they could collect and report these data, but with some difficulty; and two administrators said that they could collect and report these data fairly easily. Only one administrator responded that it would be extremely difficult to collect and report data on Indicator 1.1.

Goals 2000. Of the 46 Goals 2000 program administrators surveyed, 16 administrators were aware of the Department's program performance indicators and 14 collected data on them. In particular, 13 of the 14 administrators reported collecting data on both indicators about which they were being surveyed: Participation in Reform Efforts (Indicator 2.1) and Schools' Alignment of Key Processes (Indicator 4.2), as shown in Table 56.

Data on Participation in Reform Efforts was collected from all districts receiving program funds more frequently than was data on Schools' Alignment of Key Processes. The scope of administrators' data collection efforts varied slightly by indicator. That is, 12 administrators collected data on Participation in Reform Efforts from all subgrantees, while only eight administrators collected data from all subgrantees on Schools' Alignment of Key Processes.

Table 54

Extent to Which Title VI Program Administrators Collect Data on Federal Program Performance Indicators
(N=31)

To assist in updating and improving ED's performance indicators, we are attempting to gauge the extent to which the following information is currently collected by your state. Please provide your best estimate as to the availability of the following information. SEA Currently Collects Data?

Indicator	SEA Currently Collects Data? Yes, from ALL districts receiving program funds	Yes, from a sample of districts	No	Don't Know	Other
1.1: Reform efforts. The use of Title VI funds will show evidence that the activities supported are integral to achieving district reform plans.	20	4	4	2	0

Table 55

Title VI Program Administrators' Use of Federal Program Performance Indicator Data (N=23)

[Where data are collected] If your state collects data on any of the performance indicators listed, how is the information used?

How Data Are Used	Indicator 1.1
To identify districts and schools for which technical assistance is needed	9
To report to state officials	9
To report to federal officials	17
To identify priorities for state-level technical assistance	12
Other	6

Table 56

Extent to Which Goals 2000 Program Administrators Collect Data on Federal Program Performance Indicators
(N=16)

To assist in updating and improving ED's performance indicators, we are attempting to gauge the extent to which the following information is currently collected by your state. Please provide your best estimate as to the availability of the following information. SEA Currently Collects Data?

	SEA Currently Collects Data?				
Indicator	**Yes, from ALL districts receiving program funds**	**Yes, from a sample of districts**	**No**	**Don't Know**	**Other**
2.1: Participation in reform efforts: By 1999, as many as half of the state's school districts will actively participate in standards-based reform.	12	2	2	0	0
4.2: Schools' alignment of key processes: Surveys of principals and teachers in states with standards will indicate that schools have aligned curriculum, instruction, professional development and assessment to meet challenging state or local standards.	8	5	3	0	0

Most Goals 2000 program administrators (11 of 14), reported taking some form of corrective action when local education agencies failed to submit program performance indicator data to them. Of these, equal numbers of administrators reported assisting local school districts in writing a data collection plan and withholding program funds (seven administrators) and one state used some other form of corrective action.

Goals 2000 program administrators seemed to use data on participation in reform efforts (indicator 2.1) and schools' alignment of key processes (indicator 4.2) for the same activities. That is, nearly equal numbers of administrators used performance indicator data to report to state officials, identify priorities for state-level technical assistance, and identify districts and schools for which technical assistance is needed (Table 57).

Three Goals 2000 program administrators indicated that they do not collect data on at least one of the indicators that they were asked about. When asked how difficult it would be in the future to collect data on either Participation in Reform Efforts or Schools' Alignment of Key Processes, one administrator said that it is possible to collect these data but with some difficulty. Another administrator suggested that it is not appropriate to collect these data. The third administrator said that they could easily collect and report data on schools' alignment of key processes.

Summary: Program Performance Indicators Arrive

Both federal and state-developed program performance indicators seem to be taking hold among federally funded programs. State-developed performance indicators, for example, are emerging in more and more SEAs and about half the state administrators surveyed said they were collecting data related to the federal program performance indicators. Nevertheless, there is still room for improvement. For example, there is wide variation among programs regarding the extent to which indicators data are collected and used. In addition, most administrators who collect federal performance indicators data report using the data to report to federal officials rather than to inform program performance.

Table 57

Goals 2000 Program Administrators' Use of Federal Program Performance Indicator Data

[Where data are collected] If your state collects data on any of the performance indicators listed, how is the information used?

How Data Are Used	Indicator 2.1 (N=14)	Indicator 4.2 (N=13)
To identify districts and schools for which technical assistance is needed	11	10
To report to state officials	13	11
To report to federal officials	9	7
To identify priorities for state-level technical assistance	12	11
Other	0	1

VI. Conclusions

The policy vision of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act and the reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act was one in which schools would strive for significant improvements in student performance, using all the resources at their disposal—including the resources they obtained under federal programs, many of which continue to provide an extra boost for students at risk of failing to meet challenging standards. To help and encourage schools to make such a concerted effort, these laws emphasized the opportunities for school districts and state program administrators to break down program boundaries and to offer flexibility for local decisions.

This study provided follow-up information to the baseline study conducted in 1996-97 on the early implementation of Goals 2000 and elementary and secondary programs reauthorized under IASA. Both the baseline study and this study were designed to provide data to evaluate the impact of federal education programs and to provide data on the use of program performance indicators established pursuant to the Government Performance and Results Act.

This study found that in 1998—four years after reauthorization of ESEA and four-and-a-half years after the authorization of Goals 2000—states had made significant progress in implementing the legislation in a number of areas. The vast majority of state administrators in 1998 perceived flexibility in the legislation, and many reported using that flexibility to help districts find ways to use federal program resources to meet local needs, two positive developments since 1996-97. Consistent with these findings, more state administrators in 1998 reported requiring consolidated local applications—plans describing the intended uses of funds under more than one program—than in 1996-97. Where implementation of flexibility provisions fell short in 1998 was in taking advantage of provisions allowing consolidation of administrative funds and Ed-Flex provisions: few states reported across-the-board consolidation of administrative funds in 1998; most Ed-Flex administrators said that they believed that their state and districts were not fully using their Ed-Flex authority.

There were also some positive changes between 1996-97 and 1998 in state administrators' perceptions of the connections between program purposes and student achievement. In 1998, administrators were more likely to recognize such links and to recognize that supporting standards-based reform is part of their programs' purpose. These changes seemed due largely to efforts to coordinate program administration and operations across federal programs and the long-awaited implementation of state standards and assessment systems.

In addition, states appeared to make progress in the area of technical assistance. In 1998, program administrators showed greater coordination in the content of the technical assistance they provided than in 1996-97, and much of that content focused on a standards-based reform agenda. However, as was true in 1996-97, agency downsizing in many SEAs continued to adversely affect the technical assistance capacity in federal programs, and interviews with local program administrators indicated that states were not meeting their subgrantees' technical assistance needs.

As in 1996-97, the area in which implementation of the new federal education legislation most fell short of the original federal vision was in accountability for results. Despite progress since the baseline study, states still had far to go in building new monitoring procedures that would communicate a clear message about the new standards-based accountability framework. Although administrators seemed to have access to a great deal of data about student performance and program implementation, they were most often using the data for purposes other than judging the success of their programs in raising student achievement.

Thus, we conclude that SEAs have continued to make progress toward implementing the federal education legislation. Effects have emerged in a number of areas since the baseline study, although areas remain where additional progress is needed. In this regard, it is important to emphasize the size of the challenge that the new and reauthorized laws placed before the SEAs in 1994. A great deal of organizational learning was called for, and our two studies point to progress not only in initiating new administrative routines but also in developing a new outlook on program purposes and priorities. Although the administrators of federal programs in SEAs were not uniformly living and breathing an agenda of standards-based, data-driven reform in 1998, these studies provide evidence that they had moved in that direction in some respects and might be more strongly encouraged and helped to do so in other respects.

Bibliography

Anderson, L.M. and Turnbull, B.J. *Living in Interesting Times: Early State Implementation of New Federal Education Laws*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1998.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 [P.L. 103-382].

U.S. Department of Education. *Cross-Cutting Guidance for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act*. Washington, D.C.: Author, 1996a.

U.S. Department of Education. *Ed-Flex Fact Sheet*. Washington, D.C.: Author, 1996b.

Appendix: Survey Instruments

Follow-up Study of State Implementation of Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Programs

CORE SURVEY

Standards and Assessment:

S1. Have [this program's] funds helped support the development or review of your state's student performance standards?

a.	Yes (EXPLAIN) ____________________	1	
b.	No	2	
c.	Don't know	3	____

S2. [Where assessments aligned with standards have been/are being developed or adopted]. Since 1996, have [this program's] funds helped support the development or review of state assessments aligned with standards?

a.	Yes (EXPLAIN) ____________________	1	
b.	No	2	
c.	Don't know	3	____

S3. Can you give me examples of any changes in state administrative procedures made by this program because of state standards and/or new state assessments? [Probe for 2-3 examples]

S4. To what extent would you say this program or this state is experiencing the following problems with the implementation of standards-based reform: (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ROW)

☐ No problems ____

		Major Problem	Moderate Problem	Slight Problem	Not a Problem	Don't Know	
a.	Standards are not relevant to the services that [this program] provides	1	2	3	4	5	____
b.	Standards are not specific enough to guide teaching and learning (e.g., standards are not aligned with the curriculum)	1	2	3	4	5	____
c.	Assessments aligned with standards are not in place	1	2	3	4	5	____
d.	This programs' state level staff does not have the time to communicate a new program purpose driven by state standards	1	2	3	4	5	____
e.	This program's state level staff does not have the expertise to communicate a new program purpose driven by state standards	1	2	3	4	5	____
f.	Standards have not been approved by ED	1	2	3	4	5	____
g.	Some districts have standards that are not aligned with the state's standards	1	2	3	4	5	____
h.	State standards are changing	1	2	3	4	5	____
i.	State assessments are changing	1	2	3	4	5	____
j.	Other (SPECIFY) ____________	1	2	3	4	5	____

State Plans:

C1. Since January of 1997, has your program conducted specific administrative or operational activities (e.g., monitoring local project, providing technical assistance to districts and subgrantees, etc.) in coordination with other federally funded education programs?

a.	Yes	1	
b.	No (Why not?) ______________________________	2	**(SKIP to L1)**
	______________________________		____

C2. Since January of 1997, what among the following administrative or operational activities has your program conducted in coordination with other federally funded education programs? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Monitoring local projects	1	____
b.	Holding local application/planning workshops	1	____
c.	Providing technical assistance to districts and schools	1	____
d.	Providing before- or after-school or summer school services	1	____
e.	Decisionmaking with respect to allocating program resources to districts and schools	1	____
f.	Collecting student performance data	1	____
g.	Collecting program performance data	1	____
h.	Conducting local needs assessments	1	____
i.	Other (SPECIFY) ______________________________	1	____

C3. With which of the following federally funded education programs has your program coordinated the administrative or operational activities specified in Question C2? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Title I, Part A	1	____
b.	Even Start	1	____
c.	Migrant Education	1	____
d.	Neglected or Delinquent	1	____
e.	Eisenhower Professional Development	1	____
f.	Technology Literacy Challenge Fund	1	____
g.	Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities	1	____
h.	Title VI	1	____
i.	Education for Homeless Children and Youth	1	____
j.	Goals 2000	1	____
k.	Special Education	1	____
l.	Other (SPECIFY) ______________________________	1	____

C4. [Where relevant] Why do you coordinate administrative or operational activities with some programs and not with others?

Subgrant Plans or Applications:

L1. Does your program require or accept consolidated plans or applications (that is, combined plans or applications for more than one program) from local school districts or other subgrantees? (CIRCLE ONE)

a.	Consolidated applications are required	1		
b.	Consolidated applications are accepted but not required	2	**(SKIP to L4)**	
c.	No, this program requires a separate application	3	**(SKIP to L3)**	
d.	Consolidated plans or applications are being piloted in some districts this year	4	**(SKIP to L4)**	
e.	Other (SPECIFY) ________________	5	**(SKIP to L4)**	____

L2. Why does your program require consolidated plans or applications from local school districts or other subgrantees? **(NOTE: ANSWER THIS QUESTION AND SKIP TO QUESTION L4)**

L3. Why does your program require a separate subgrant plan or application? **(NOTE: ANSWER THIS QUESTION AND SKIP TO QUESTION M1)**

L4. Are reviews of local consolidated plans or applications conducted jointly for [this program] and other programs? (CIRCLE ONE)

a.	Yes (SPECIFY Programs) ________________	1	
b.	No, applications are not reviewed jointly	2	
c.	Other (SPECIFY) ________________	3	
d.	Don't know	4	____

L5a. How well would you say the local consolidated plans or applications provide you with the following types of information about **[this program]**? (NOTE: If you do not require districts to report any or all of the following types of information in their plans/applications, CIRCLE 5" for NA) **(CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ROW)**

		Very Well	Fairly Well	Not Very Well	Poorly	NA	
a.	Outcome data on program participants	1	2	3	4	5	____
b.	Community needs assessment	1	2	3	4	5	____
c.	Participation and/or attendance data	1	2	3	4	5	____
d.	Evaluation of service quality	1	2	3	4	5	____
e.	Summaries of services rendered	1	2	3	4	5	____
f.	Evidence of additional services needed	1	2	3	4	5	____
g.	Evidence of varied demographic and ethnic group participation	1	2	3	4	5	____
h.	Indicators of collaboration with other programs	1	2	3	4	5	____
i.	Client satisfaction ratings	1	2	3	4	5	____
j.	ED's program performance indicators	1	2	3	4	5	____
k.	Other (SPECIFY) ____________	1	2	3	4	5	____

L5b. What among the information listed in Question L5a do you need from the consolidated plans/applications to make decisions about [this program]? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a. b. c. d. e. f. g. h. i. j. k.

L6. What are the strengths and weaknesses of local implementation of the consolidated plans, as far as you know? **(NOTE:** If you don't know, check the box below and go on to question M1) (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

☐ I can't say; I don't have enough information about local implementation **(GO to M1)**

a.	Working together across programs has been difficult for local staff (EXPLAIN) ______________________	1
b.	Working together across programs has helped local staff learn about each others' programs and identify opportunities to coordinate administrative and operational activities	1
c.	A consolidated plan sharpens local educators' focus on enabling all students to meet the standards	1
d.	A consolidated plan detracts from the attention paid to the purposes of [this program]	1
e.	Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	1

How do you know this? ______________________

____

State Monitoring:

M1. In the past 12 months, about what proportion of [this program's] subgrantees received monitoring visits? (CIRCLE ONE)

a.	Half or more	1
b.	Between one-fourth and one-half	2
c.	Fewer than one-fourth	3
d.	None, but we plan to conduct monitoring visits in the future	4
e.	None	5
f.	Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	6

M2. On what basis is it decided which subgrantees to visit? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	There is a routine cycle for visits	1	
b.	Visits are triggered by information suggesting that the grantee is having trouble meeting program requirements (SPECIFY type and source of information): ____________	1	
c.	Visits are triggered by information about student performance (SPECIFY type and source of information): ____________	1	
d.	Subgrantees are visited at their request	1	
e.	Other (SPECIFY) ____________	1	

M3. What priorities are addressed through state monitoring? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Student outcomes	1	
b.	Progress in tracking activities outlined in local plans	1	
c.	Use of federal funds to support state and local reform efforts	1	
d.	Compliance with federal programs requirements	1	
e.	Other (SPECIFY) ____________	1	

M4. Has this state conducted any integrated monitoring visits that address [this program] and other federal or state programs? (CIRCLE ONE)

a.	Yes, with other federally funded programs only	1	
b.	Yes, with both federally and state-funded programs	2	
c.	No	3	**(SKIP to M8b)**
d.	Other (SPECIFY) ____________	4	**(SKIP to M8b)**

M5. In the past 12 months, approximately what proportion of your program's monitoring visits were conducted as part of an integrated monitoring process? (CIRCLE ONE)

a.	All	1	
b.	Half or more, but not all	2	
c.	Between one-fourth and one-half	3	
d.	Fewer than one-fourth	4	
e.	None	5	**(SKIP to M8b)**
f.	Other (SPECIFY) ____________	6	

M6. With which of the following programs does [this program] participate in integrated monitoring visits? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Title I, Part A	1
b.	Even Start	1
c.	Migrant Education	1
d.	N or D	1
e.	Eisenhower (Title II)	1
f.	Technology Literacy Challenge Fund	1
g.	Safe and Drug Free Schools	1
h.	Title VI	1
i.	Education for Homeless Children and Youth	1
j.	Goals 2000	1
k.	Special Education	1
l.	Other programs in the SEA (SPECIFY) ____________	1
m.	Programs in other state agencies (SPECIFY) ____________	1
n.	Other (SPECIFY) ____________	1

M7. [If relevant] To your knowledge, why are certain programs included in integrated monitoring visits while others are not?

M8a. [For programs participating in integrated monitoring visits] To what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding the strengths and weaknesses of your program's project monitoring process? (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ROW) **(NOTE: ANSWER THIS QUESTION AND SKIP TO QUESTION M8c)**

		Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
a.	Integrated monitoring visits have reduced the cost of monitoring for this program	1	2	3	4	____
b.	Having a variety of programs represented in the monitoring process gives a more complete picture of what subgrantees are doing	1	2	3	4	____
c.	Having a variety of programs represented in the monitoring process provides more solutions to subgrantees' difficulties	1	2	3	4	____
d.	Integrated monitoring visits are too general/less in-depth than program-specific visits	1	2	3	4	____
e.	Integrated monitoring hampers our ability to collect the program-specific data we need	1	2	3	4	____
f.	Integrated monitoring team members lack the expertise to help individual programs	1	2	3	4	____
g.	Integrated monitoring teams overwhelm small districts where one person may administer several programs	1	2	3	4	____

M8b. [For programs that are NOT participating in integrated monitoring visits] To what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding the strengths and weaknesses of your program's project monitoring process? (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ROW)

		Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
a.	We are no longer able to visit as many subgrantees because of a lack of staffing/funds (Since when? ____________)	1	2	3	4	____
b.	We are no longer able to visit as many subgrantees because of the time demands of revising/developing our monitoring process (Since when? ________________________)	1	2	3	4	____
c.	Monitoring visits no longer have to focus so strongly on compliance issues (Since when? __________________)	1	2	3	4	____
d.	Program staff are knowledgeable about implementation and operations issues and can provide technical assistance to subgrantees	1	2	3	4	____

M8c. How, if at all, does [this program] provide feedback to local districts about the monitoring visit? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	By sending districts/subgrantees a written feedback report	1	____
b.	By addressing the subject at a statewide or regional meeting	1	____
c.	By giving districts informal feedback over the telephone	1	____
d.	Other (SPECIFY) ________________________________	1	____
e.	It doesn't (Why not?) ______________________________ ____	1	____

M8d. What changes have been made or recommended for state and local program administration and operations as a result of [this program's] monitoring visits/activities?

Federal Monitoring:

M9. The U.S. Department of Education (ED) has changed its approach to program monitoring. Are you aware that ED has established Regional Service Teams to conduct integrated reviews of federal elementary and secondary education programs?

a.	Yes	1		
b.	No	2	**(SKIP to M12)**	____

M10. Have you been contacted by a member of a Regional Service Team regarding an integrated review of federal elementary and secondary education programs? (CIRCLE ONE)

a.	Yes, our state has been visited by a Regional Service Team	1	
b.	Yes, our state has been contacted by a Regional Service Team member	2	
c.	No, our state has had no contact with a Regional Service Team	3	____

M11. How useful do you think the Department's strategy for conducting integrated reviews will be/has been to implementing [this program] to support comprehensive standards-based reform? (CIRCLE ONE)

a.	Very useful	1	
b.	Useful	2	
c.	Somewhat useful	3	
d.	Not useful	4	
e.	Don't know	5	____

M12. Do you have comments or concerns regarding integrated program reviews?

Building Capacity for Improvement:

P1. In the past year, did any of your written or personal communications encourage subgrantees to pool [this program's] funds for professional development with those of any other federal or state program(s)?

a.	Yes (SPECIFY PROGRAMS) ______________________________ ______________________________	1	
b.	No	2	____

P2. In the past year, has your program funded or directly provided technical assistance to subgrantees on any of the following topics: (**NOTE**: If your program did not fund or directly provide technical assistance to subgrantees, check the box below and go on to Question P7) (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

☐ NA: We did not fund or directly provide technical assistance to subgrantees. **(GO to P7)** ____

		Funded TA	Directly Provided TA	No	
a.	Content or performance standards	1	2	3	____
b.	Student assessment	1	2	3	____
c.	Planning and carrying out whole-school improvement	1	2	3	____
d.	Specific academic subject(s) (e.g., reading, math)	1	2	3	____
e.	Meeting the needs of special populations	1	2	3	____
f.	Adopting and implementing particular model programs	1	2	3	____
g.	Effective roles for instructional aides	1	2	3	____
h.	Techniques for working with families	1	2	3	____
i.	Extended instructional time	1	2	3	____
j.	Use of data-driven decision making (e.g., student assessments)	1	2	3	____
k.	Use of educational technology	1	2	3	____
l.	Program coordination	1	2	3	____
m.	School safety	1	2	3	____
n.	Other(s) (SPECIFY): ____________________	1	2	3	____

P3. In the past year, which THREE of the following factors most influenced your selection of technical assistance topics that your program funded or directly provided to subgrantees? (CIRCLE THREE ONLY)

a.	Program purposes/goals	1	____
b.	Goals arising from consolidated planning	1	____
c.	State goals and priorities	1	____
d.	Federal legislation/regulations	1	
e.	U.S. Department of Education guidance	1	
f.	State legislation/regulations	1	
g.	Anecdotal information about or personal observations of subgrantees' needs	1	
h.	Program evaluation data (SPECIFY) ____________________	1	
i.	State student assessment data (SPECIFY) ____________________	1	
j.	Subgrantees' suggestions	1	
k.	Other (SPECIFY) ____________________	1	

P4. In your estimation, to what extent has your program been able to meet your subgrantees' technical assistance needs in the past year? (CIRCLE ONE)

a.	Great extent	1	**(SKIP TO P6)**	
b.	Some extent	2		
c.	A little	3		
d.	Not at all	4		____

Please explain: ____

____

P5. What prevents your program from meeting your subgrantees' technical assistance needs? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Insufficient staff size	1	____
b.	Lack of program funds	1	____
c.	Lack of knowledge and expertise among state-level staff	1	____
d.	Lack of knowledge and expertise among available contractors	1	____
e.	Other (SPECIFY)________________________	1	____

P6. What are the priorities for allocating this program's technical assistance resources? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Districts with low achievement	1	____
b.	Districts with less experienced program managers	1	____
c.	Districts that request help	1	____
d.	High-poverty districts	1	____
e.	Districts with program compliance problems	1	____
f.	Other (SPECIFY):________________________	1	____

P7. In the past year, how helpful have each of the following sources of information been in informing your understanding of the federal legislative provisions affecting your program? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

		Very Helpful	Helpful	A Little Helpful	Not at All Helpful	No Contact	
a.	Written information from U.S. Department of Education (ED) (e.g., guidance, other mailings)	1	2	3	4	5	____
b.	Other contacts with ED (e.g., conferences, workshops, on-line services, telephone)	1	2	3	4	5	____
c.	Regional Educational Laboratories	1	2	3	4	5	____
d.	Comprehensive Centers	1	2	3	4	5	____
e.	Eisenhower Math/Science consortia	1	2	3	4	5	____
f.	Professional associations (e.g., CCSSO)	1	2	3	4	5	____
g.	Institutions of higher education	1	2	3	4	5	____
h.	Other states	1	2	3	4	5	____
i.	Other (SPECIFY) ________________	1	2	3	4	5	____

P8. In the past year, how would you rate the timeliness with which you have received information from the U.S. Department of Education regarding the federal legislative provisions affecting your program? (CIRCLE ONE)

a.	Very slow	1	
b.	Somewhat slow	2	
c.	Somewhat timely	3	
d.	Very Timely	4	____

P9 [Where applicable] With respect to each of the following topics, how helpful was the technical assistance provided by the ________________________ [INTERVIEWER: Write in name of Center] in the past year? (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ROW)

☐ NA: We have had no contact with the Comprehensive Center serving our region/program **(GO TO P10)** ____

		NA: Didn't Receive	Very Helpful	Helpful	A Little Helpful	Not at All Helpful	
a.	Content or performance standards	1	2	3	4	5	____
b.	Student assessment	1	2	3	4	5	____
c.	Disaggregation of performance data	1	2	3	4	5	____
d.	Designing assessments to accommodate the needs of students with limited English proficiency and students with Individual Educational Programs (IEPs)	1	2	3	4	5	____
e.	Developing and implementing measures of adequate yearly progress (AYP)	1	2	3	4	5	____
f.	Identifying schools in need of improvement	1	2	3	4	5	____
g.	Developing and reviewing applications for the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program	1	2	3	4	5	____
h.	Planning and carrying out whole-school reform	1	2	3	4	5	____
i.	Specific academic subject(s) (e.g., reading, math)	1	2	3	4	5	____
j.	Meeting the needs of special populations	1	2	3	4	5	____
k.	Other (SPECIFY) ________________________	1	2	3	4	5	____

P10. When you are making decisions about how to administer [this program], which of the following sources of guidance are generally the most influential? Which THREE of the following are the most influential sources of guidance? (CIRCLE THREE)

a.	U.S. Department of Education	1	____
b.	Key policymakers in the SEA	1	____
c.	Other state administrators of federal programs in this state	1	____
d.	State administrators of federal programs in other states	1	
e.	Multi-state providers of technical assistance (e.g., Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers)	1	
f.	Local districts or other subgrantees	1	
g.	Other (SPECIFY) ________________________	1	

Educational Technology:

T1. Have [this program's] funds helped support the development of a statewide plan for acquiring and using technology in education?

a.	Yes	1	
b.	No	2	____

T2. In the past year, has the statewide plan for acquiring and using technology in education influenced [this program's] decisionmaking with respect to educational technology purchases?

a.	Yes (EXPLAIN)______________________	1	
b.	No	2	
c.	Not familiar with statewide plan for acquiring and using technology in education	3	____

T3. In the past year, to what extent has the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund program influenced [this program's] decisionmaking with respect to educational technology purchases? (CIRCLE ONE)

a.	To a great extent	1	
b.	To some extent	2	
c.	A little	3	
d.	Not at all	4	____

Please explain ____

____

T4. Have [this program's] funds been used for educational technology purchases?

a.	Yes	1	
b.	No	2	____

Administrative Flexibility:

F1. Is your state using the provision in the reauthorized ESEA that allows it to consolidate administrative funding under different programs? (CIRCLE ONE)

a.	Yes	1	
b.	Yes, but [this program] is not part of the consolidation	**2 (SKIP to F5)**	
b.	No (Why not?)______________________	**3 (SKIP to F5)**	
c.	Don't know	**4 (SKIP to F5)**	____

F2. With which of the following programs is your program consolidating its administrative funds? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Title I, Part A	1	____
b.	Even Start	1	____
c.	Migrant Education	1	____
d.	Neglected or Delinquent	1	____
e.	Eisenhower Professional Development	1	____
f.	Technology Literacy Challenge Fund	1	____
g.	Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities	1	____
h.	Title VI	1	____
i.	Education for Homeless Children and Youth	1	____
j.	Goals 2000	1	____
k.	Other (SPECIFY)______________________	1	____

F3. To what extent has this consolidation of funds affected the way you do your job? How?

a. To a considerable extent (SPECIFY)________________________ 1

____

b. Somewhat (SPECIFY)________________________ 2

____

c. Not at all (PLEASE EXPLAIN) ________________________ 3

____

d. [Program] not part of the consolidation of administrative funds . . . . 4 **(SKIP to F5)** _____

F4. To what extent has consolidating administrative funds affected your program's capacity to do the following? (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ROW)

		Increased Capacity	Decreased Capacity	No Effect	Don't Know	N/A	
a.	Provide technical assistance to subgrantees	1	2	3	4	5	_____
b.	Participate in state-level cross-program planning	1	2	3	4	5	_____
c.	Coordinate program services and operations among other state and federal programs	1	2	3	4	5	_____
d.	Monitor local projects	1	2	3	4	5	_____
e.	Participate in the development of state standards	1	2	3	4	5	_____
f.	Participate in the development of state assessments	1	2	3	4	5	_____
g.	Accept and review consolidated subgrant applications	1	2	3	4	5	_____
h.	Engage in data-driven decisionmaking	1	2	3	4	5	_____
i.	Other (SPECIFY) ______________________________	1	2	3	4	5	_____

F5. Taking into account all of your office's responsibilities under this program, to what extent do you find that this legislation gives you more administrative flexibility than you had before the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1994? **(NOTE: IF TLCF PROGRAM, SKIP to QUESTION F6)** (CIRCLE ONE)

a. To a considerable extent 1
b. Somewhat 2
c. Not at all 3
d. No change . . . . 4 _____

F6. Please elaborate on the ways in which you need additional flexibility from the federal and state levels to more successfully administer your program.

F7. In what ways, if at all, has flexibility from the federal and state levels--or lack of flexibility--affected the performance of your program?

Program Accountability:

A1. In general, how often does this program collect and/or receive program performance information from local school districts, schools, or subgrantees? (CIRCLE ONE)

a.	Quarterly	1	
b.	Semiannually	2	
c.	Annually	3	
d.	Every two years	4	
e.	Every three years	5	____

A2. Does this program collect any information related to student performance?

a.	Yes	1	
b.	No	2 (SKIP to A4)	____

A3a. What information about student performance are local school districts, schools, and subgrantees required to report to this program regarding program participants? (**NOTE**: If categories of student information are not available for students participating in this program, CIRCLE "3" for "NA") (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ROW)

☐ This program does not require school districts, schools, or subgrantees to report on program participants' performance (**GO to A4**). ____

		Yes	No	NA	
a.	Performance results from the state assessment	1	2	3	____
b.	Performance results from tests other than the state's assessment	1	2	3	____
c.	Performance results from course-related tests (e.g., end-of-course, advanced placement, state honors examinations)	1	2	3	____
d.	Distribution of student grades	1	2	3	____
e.	Rates of student participation in accelerated courses or academic honors programs in high poverty schools	1	2	3	____
f.	Examples of student work	1	2	3	____
g.	Rates of participation in extracurricular activities	1	2	3	____
h.	Dropout rates	1	2	3	____
i.	Absentee rates	1	2	3	____
j.	Incidences of school disruption	1	2	3	____
k.	Other (SPECIFY) ____________________	1	2	3	____

A3b. Of the student performance information that local school districts, schools, and subgrantees are required to report to this program, which, if any, must be disaggregated or broken down in some way--for example, by school, poverty level, race/ethnicity, migrant status, or limited English proficiency (LEP) status? (**NOTE:** If categories of information are not available for students participating in this program OR are not disaggregated in some way, CIRCLE "N/A")

Student Performance Information is Disaggregated by:

			Poverty	Race/	Migrant	LEP		
		School	Level	Ethnicity	Status	Status	N/A	
a.	Performance results from the state assessment	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___	6	___
b.	Performance results from tests other than the state's assessment	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___	6	___
c.	Performance results from course-related tests (e.g., end-of-course, advanced placement, state honors examinations)	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___	6	___
d.	Distribution of student grades	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___	6	___
e.	Rates of student participation in accelerated courses or academic honors programs in high poverty schools	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___	6	___
f.	Examples of student work	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___	6	___
g.	Rates of participation in extracurricular activities	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___	6	___
h.	Dropout rates	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___	6	___
i.	Absentee rates	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___	6	___
j.	Incidences of school disruption	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___	6	___
k.	Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___	6	___

A4. What information about program implementation are local school districts, schools, or other subgrantees required to report to this program? (**NOTE:** If categories of program implementation are not applicable or relevant to this program, CIRCLE "3" for "NA") (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ROW)

		Yes	No	NA	
a.	Summaries of services rendered	1	2	3	___
b.	Evaluations of service quality	1	2	3	___
c.	Client satisfaction ratings	1	2	3	___
d.	Evidence of additional services needed	1	2	3	___
e.	Levels of parent involvement	1	2	3	___
f.	Levels of community involvement (other than parents)	1	2	3	___
g.	Evidence of varied demographic and ethnic group participation	1	2	3	___
h.	Indicators of collaboration with other programs	1	2	3	___
i.	Staff satisfaction ratings	1	2	3	___
j.	Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	1	2	3	___

A5. How does this program ensure that appropriate measures are being followed among local school districts, schools, or other subgrantees in processing and reporting student performance and program implementation data?

A6. In addition to the information that local school districts, schools, or other subgrantees may report to this program, what data collection strategies does this program use to obtain program performance information? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Mail surveys (e.g., of program staff, of clients, etc.)	1	____
b.	Telephone surveys	1	____
c.	Surveys of project administrators (e.g., distributed and returned at program-sponsored events such as workshops or conferences)	1	____
d.	On-site observations of local project services and activities	1	____
e.	In-person interviews of project administrators	1	____
f.	Customer focus groups/surveys	1	____
g.	Analyses of requests for information from the field	1	____
h.	Web site "hits"	1	____
i.	Informal conversations with project staff	1	____
j.	We use data from other offices within the SEA (e.g., assessment) (SPECIFY TYPE and SOURCE of DATA) ____________________	1	____
k.	Other (SPECIFY) ____________________	1	____
l.	None of the above	1	____

A7. How does this program use the student performance and program implementation information it collects from the field? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

		Student Performance		Program Implementation	
a.	To identify program services that need to be extended or reduced	1	____	2	____
b.	To assess progress of underserved ethnic or demographic groups	1	____	2	____
c.	To report to managers within the state agency	1	____	2	____
d.	To report to the state board of education	1	____	2	____
e.	To report to local school districts, schools, and subgrantees	1	____	2	____
f.	To report to the federal government	1	____	2	____
g.	To identify districts in need of improvement	1	____	2	____
h.	To identify schools in need of improvement	1	____	2	____
i.	Other (SPECIFY) ____________________	1	____	2	____

A8. Which, if any, of the following have occurred as a result of the availability of program and student performance data, as described above? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Improved communication with program subgrantees	1	____
b.	Provided documentation to support funding requests	1	____
c.	Enabled us to quickly address the performance variability that occurs among demographic and ethnic groups	1	____
d.	Enabled us to adjust programming	1	____
e.	Focused the program staff on student results and achievement	1	____
f.	Promoted coordination with other federal, state, and local programs	1	____
g.	Enabled program staff to inform the state board of education and other interested public communities about program status	1	____
h.	Other (SPECIFY) ____________________	1	____

A9. Outside of Title I school improvement, does this state have its own procedures for identifying failing schools and correcting their problems? (CIRCLE ONE)

a.	Yes	1	
b.	No	2 **(SKIP to O1)**	
c.	Don't know	3 **(SKIP to O1)**	____

A10. Does your program make any decisions or provide any services based on state-level data identifying failing schools?

a. Yes (SPECIFY) ______________________________ 1

____

b. No (WHY NOT?) ______________________________ 2

____

c. Not yet; in the process of developing an accountability system that makes use of state-level data identifying failing schools 3 ____

Overall Successes and Problems:

O1. Taking into account your experience with the administration of [this program] in the last 12 months, what would you say is working well? How do you know this? Which legislative provisions have contributed to these successes?

O2. What would you say have been the greatest problems in implementation in the last 12 months? How do you know this? Which legislative provisions have contributed to these problems or are barriers to [this program]'s success?

O3. What about your program's organization and/or operations affects the extent to which you can focus on improving student achievement?

O4. In what areas do you think your state has the farthest to go in meeting its own reform goals?

O5. In what ways, if any, do you think the reauthorized [program] reinforces the direction in which your state is moving?

O6. In your estimation, are your program funds used to support state reform goals?

a. Yes (SPECIFY)____ 1

____

b. No . . . . 2 ____

O7. Since the reauthorization of ESEA in 1994, has your SEA been downsized or reorganized in a way that has affected the staffing of [this program]?

a. Yes (SPECIFY) ____ 1
b. No . . . . 2 ____

O8. How, if at all, does your SEA's organization and operations affect the administration of your program?

Additional Items for the State Coordinator of Title I, Part A

1. What has your office done to inform districts and schools about the provisions for schoolwide programs? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Conducted workshops that discuss schoolwide programs among other topics	1	_____
b.	Conducted workshops specifically focused on schoolwide programs	1	_____
c.	Called district officials to suggest they consider schoolwide programs	1	_____
d.	Sent information by mail or e-mail to district officials	1	_____
e.	Sent information by mail or e-mail to principals of eligible schools	1	_____
f.	Other (SPECIFY)________________________________	1	_____
g.	None of the above	1	_____

2a. What percent of the following types of schools did school support teams serve in the past 12 months? (NOTE: If you do not know, CIRCLE "1" for "Don't Know")

		Percent of Schools	Don't Know	
a.	Schools in need of improvement	______%	1	_____
b.	Schoolwide programs	______%	1	_____
c.	Other (SPECIFY)	______%	1	_____

2b. In the past 12 months, were there more schools in need of school support team services than your program could accommodate?

a.	Yes	1	
b.	No, my program was able to accommodate all schools that had a need	2	
c.	Other (SPECIFY) ________________________________	3	_____

3. Among the following, select the FIVE topics on which schools and districts most frequently request assistance from school support teams. (CHOOSE FIVE)

a.	I am not familiar enough with the team's activities to know	1	_____
b.	Strategies for conducting needs assessments	1	_____
c.	Using assessment information from multiple data sources	1	_____
d.	Collecting and analyzing non-cognitive student data (i.e., attendance, participation in extra curricular activities, support for learning at home)	1	_____
e.	Understanding cultural diversity	1	_____
f.	Developing curriculum	1	_____
g.	Understanding and implementing standards-based reforms	1	_____
h.	Identifying successful instructional strategies/improving instruction	1	_____
i.	Evaluating schoolwide programs	1	_____
j.	Identifying additional sources of program funding	1	_____
k.	Adopting/implementing particular model programs	1	_____
l.	Other (SPECIFY) ________________________________	1	_____

4. What kind of a commitment to schools do school support teams typically make? (CIRCLE ONE)

a.	Single event	1	____
b.	Provide a series of structured, pre-defined events	1	____
c.	Level of commitment depends on the nature of the school's or LEA's request	1	____
d.	Guarantee a minimum number of consultations for one year	1	____
e.	Guarantee consultation for more than one year (SPECIFY # YEARS________)	1	____
f.	Other (SPECIFY) ________________________________	1	____

5. How does this state evaluate the effectiveness of its school support teams? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Systematic data collection from participating schools	1	____
b.	More informal feedback from participating schools	1	____
c.	Feedback from school support teams	1	____
d.	Other (SPECIFY) ________________________________	1	____
e.	It doesn't	1	____

6. Has your office issued written guidance to school districts regarding the provision of Title I services to private school students based on the Agostini v. Felton decision?

a.	Yes (WHEN?) ______________________________	1	
b.	No	2	____

7. Among the following Title I assessment requirements, which have been difficult for this state to understand or to carry out? **(NOTE: If none, check the box below and go on to Question 8a)** (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

☐ None **(GO TO QUESTION 8a)**

a.	Developing or adopting assessments that are aligned with the state's challenging content and student performance standards and provide coherent information about student attainment of such standards	1	____
b.	Ensuring that assessments are administered at least once between grades 3-5, and again between grades 6-9 and grades 10-12	1	____
c.	Developing or adopting assessments that are consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical standards	1	____
d.	Developing or adopting assessments that measure student proficiency in the academic subjects where there are state content standards	1	____
e.	Developing or adopting assessments that measure student proficiency in the academic subjects where there are student performance standards	1	____
f.	Developing or adopting assessments that provide for reasonable adaptations and accommodations for students with special education needs	1	____
g.	Developing or adopting assessments that provide for reasonable adaptations and accommodations for migrant students	1	____
h.	Developing or adopting assessments that provide for reasonable adaptations and accommodations for students with limited English proficiency	1	____
i.	Developing or adopting assessments that allow for the disaggregation of results within each state, district, and school by gender, race, ethnicity, English proficiency, and migrant status (SPECIFY AREAS OF DIFFICULTY)________________________	1	____
j.	Tracking academic progress of students who transfer among schools within a single academic year	1	____
k.	Developing or adopting assessments that enable comparisons to be made between economically disadvantaged/advantaged students	1	____
l.	Responding to the Title I requirements in a state where districts choose their own assessments	1	____
m.	Other (SPECIFY) ____	1	____

8a. For this year, 1997-98, is this state using transitional assessments for Title I? (NOTE: In the space provided, the interviewer should write the information listed in the state plan and review it with the respondent)

a.	Yes (DESCRIBE)____ ____	1	
b.	No; the state allows districts to choose their own assessments	2 **(SKIP to Q12a)**	
c.	No; the state's assessment system has been approved by the U.S. Department of Education	3 **(SKIP to Q13)**	____

8b. Are the transitional assessments used for Title I accountability the same assessments as those used for the state?

a.	Yes	1	
b.	No (EXPLAIN) ____ ____	2	
c.	Don't know	3	____

9. To what extent, if at all, are special accommodations made in the transitional assessment to include the following categories of students? (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ROW)

		Great Extent	Some Extent	A Little	Not at All	Don't Know	
a.	Students with limited English proficiency	1	2	3	4	5	____
b.	Migrant students	1	2	3	4	5	____
c.	Students with disabilities	1	2	3	4	5	____
d.	Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	1	2	3	4	5	____

10. What percentage of students in the following categories are included in Title I transitional assessments? (NOTE: If you don't know, circle "1" under "Don't Know")

		Percent of Students Included In Transitional Assessment	Don't Know	
a.	Students with limited English proficiency	______	1	____
b.	Migrant students	______	1	____
c.	Students with disabilities	______	1	____
d.	Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	______	1	____

11. [If using transitional assessment], How do you anticipate that the final assessment will differ from the current transitional assessment? **(NOTE: ANSWER THIS QUESTION AND GO TO QUESTION 15)**

12a. Please describe the tests and procedures, if any, districts use for Title I accountability.

12b. In your estimation, to what extent are districts carrying out the Title I requirements for assessment? (CIRCLE ONE) **(NOTE: ANSWER THIS QUESTION AND GO ON TO QUESTION 15)**

a.	To a great extent	1	
b.	Somewhat	2	
c.	A little	3	
d.	Not at all	4	____

How do you know this? ____

____

13. Please describe the tests and procedures currently used for Title I in your state [NOTE to Interviewer: In the space provided, write the Title I tests and procedures as described in the state plan; verify that the information is current.]

14. To what extent, if at all, are the following categories of students included in the tests and procedures used for Title I?

		Great Extent	Some Extent	A Little	Not at All	Don't Know	
a.	Students with limited English proficiency	1	2	3	4	5	____
b.	Migrant students	1	2	3	4	5	____
c.	Students with disabilities	1	2	3	4	5	____
d.	Other (SPECIFY) ________________	1	2	3	4	5	____

[NOTE to Interviewer: Review the definition of adequate yearly progress (AYP) for schools and local school districts in the state plan. Write the definitions of AYP for schools and for school districts in the spaces below and review them with the respondent. Verify that definitions still apply.]

15. [Review measure of adequate yearly progress for schools and local school districts]

a. (DESCRIBE AYP for SCHOOLS) ________________________________ 1 ____

____

b. (DESCRIBE AYP for DISTRICTS) ________________________________ 1 ____

____

c. The state has not yet developed measures of adequate yearly progress for either schools or local school districts (WHY NOT?)________________ 1 **(SKIP to Q17a)** ____

16a. If your state has developed adequate yearly progress measures for schools and/or local school districts, do you personally believe the expectations are too high, too low, or about right (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ROW)

		Too High	Too Low	About Right	Don't Have a Measure Yet	
a.	Schools	1	2	3	4	____
b.	Local school districts	1	2	3	4	____

16b. Is the Title I accountability system the same as the accountability system used for the state? (CIRCLE ONE)

a.	Yes	1
b.	No; the state does not have an accountability system	2
c.	No	3
d.	Don't know	4

____

17a. What challenges, if any, do you face in identifying Title I districts in need of improvement? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Applying the measure(s) of progress included in the definition of AYP for districts	1	____
b.	Measuring growth when the state assessment system keeps changing	1	____
c.	Measuring growth when the local assessment system keeps changing	1	____
d.	Conveying to districts the criteria that are used in identifying districts in need of improvement	1	____
e.	Collecting school-level data from districts	1	____
f.	Accessing state-level student performance data	1	____
g.	Other (SPECIFY) ____________________	1	____
h.	None	1	____

17b. What challenges, if any, do districts face in identifying Title I schools in need of improvement? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Applying the measure(s) of progress included in the definition of AYP for schools	1	____
b.	Measuring growth when the state assessment system keeps changing	1	____
c.	Measuring growth when the local assessment system keeps changing	1	____
d.	Conveying to schools the criteria that are used in identifying schools in need of improvement	1	____
e.	Collecting school-level data from districts	1	____
f.	Accessing state-level student performance data	1	____
g.	Other (SPECIFY) ____________________	1	____
h.	None	1	____

18. Does the state reward local school districts--at some time interval (e.g., annually, biannually)--that have the best record of improving student performance?

a.	Yes [SPECIFY REWARD(S)] ____________________ ____________________	1	
b.	No	2	____

19. In which of the following ways does this state initiate corrective action against LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS whose schools have not made adequate progress in improving student performance? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	It does not	1	____
b.	Assist local school districts in developing a plan to address specific student problems	1	____
c.	Withhold Title I funds	1	____
d.	Reconstitute school district personnel	1	____
e.	Remove particular schools from the local school district's jurisdiction and establish alternative arrangements for their public governance and supervision	1	____
f.	Abolish or restructure the local school district	1	____
g.	Authorize students to transfer from low performing schools	1	____
h.	Other (SPECIFY) ____________________	1	____

20. In which of the following ways does this state reward SCHOOLS that have the best record of improving student performance? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a. It does not . . . . . 1 ____
b. Designate schools as distinguished . . . . . 1 ____
c. Encourage educators in rewarded schools to serve as mentors to other educators and schools . . . . . 1 ____
d. Include educators from achieving schools on school support teams . . . . . 1 ____
e. Provide monetary rewards to achieving school districts . . . . . 1 ____
f. Provide monetary rewards directly to the staff in achieving schools . . . . . 1 ____
g. Other (SPECIFY) ________________________ 1 ____

____

21. Using the U.S. Department of Education definition of performance indicators as measures that show the degree to which key programs achieve desired performance levels, has this program developed performance indicators?

a. Yes (OBTAIN A COPY) 1
b. No 2
c. Developing . . . . . 3 ____

22. Has your program jointly developed performance indicators with other federal programs?

a. Yes (SPECIFY PROGRAMS) ________________________ 1
b. No . . . . . 2 ____

23. If your program has developed program performance indicators, how do you and your colleagues in this program office use them? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a. To provide state and local administrators with a common language for defining program results . . . . . 1 ____
b. To help program staff focus on program goals and objectives . . . . . 1 ____
c. To provide program outcome data for administrative planning . . . . . 1 ____
d. To enable this program to engage in cross-program coordination . . . . . 1 ____
e. To monitor the progress of local programs or subgrantees . . . . . 1 ____
f. To provide information about existing or potential problems . . . . . 1 ____
g. To keep the state board of education or legislature informed about the program's progress . . . . . 1 ____
h. To provide consumer-oriented information about program performance . . . . . 1 ____
i. Other (SPECIFY) ________________________ 1 ____

24. In response to the requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act, the U.S. Department of Education (ED) has developed a set of performance indicators for the **Title I Part A** program. Are you aware of the indicators?

a. Yes 1
b. No . . . . . 2 **(SKIP to Q31)** ____

25. To assist in updating and improving ED's performance indicators, we are attempting to gauge the extent to which the following information is currently collected by your state. Please provide your best estimates as to the availability of the following information. (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH INDICATOR)

Performance Indicator	**SEA Currently Collects Data?**				
	Yes, from ALL districts receiving program funds	Yes, from a sample of districts	No	Don't Know	Other
2.3: **Research-based curriculum and instruction.** The proportion of schools using comprehensive, research-based approaches to improve curriculum and instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
2.6: **Qualified teacher aides.** The percent of districts providing support for the educational improvement of paraprofessionals/ teacher aides will increase	1	2	3	4	5
4.3a: **Accountability: intervention.** States and districts provide assistance to schools not making progress (through school support teams and other sources).	1	2	3	4	5
4.3b: **Accountability: assistance.** States and districts will take appropriate action with schools that consistently fail.	1	2	3	4	5

26. [Where data are collected] What kinds of problems, if any, do you experience in collecting information in your state on the performance indicators listed in Question 25?

[Where data are collected] If your state collects data on any of the performance indicators (listed above), how is the information used? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

		Indicator 2.3	Indicator 2.6	Indicator 4.3a	Indicator 4.3b
a.	To identify districts and schools for which technical assistance is needed	1	2	3	4
b.	To report to state officials	1	2	3	4
c.	To report to federal officials	1	2	3	4
d.	To identify priorities for state-level technical assistance	1	2	3	4
e.	Other (SPECIFY) ____________________	1	2	3	4

28. [Where data are collected] In which of the following ways, if any, does your state initiate corrective action against local school districts that fail to submit data to the state on the indicators for which data have been requested and/or required? **[NOTE: ANSWER THIS QUESTION AND GO ON TO QUESTION 31]**

a. It does not . . . . 1 ____
b. Assist local school districts in developing a plan to collect the data . . . . 1 ____
c. Withhold program funds . . . . 1 ____
d. Other (SPECIFY) ______________________________ . . 1 ____

29a. [Where data are NOT collected] If you are not collecting data on any or all of the indicators listed in Question 25, how difficult would it be to start? Please indicate the extent to which data are available from districts for each of the indicators listed in Question 25. [NOTE: If you do not believe it would be appropriate to collect data on any or all of the indicators, circle "4" for "Not Appropriate.") (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ROW)

		Could Collect from Districts and Report Fairly Easily	Possible to Collect from Districts & Report, But w/ Some Difficulty	Extremely Difficult to Collect & Report	Not Appropriate	Don't Know	
a.	Indicator 2.3: Research-based curriculum and instruction	1	2	3	4	5	____
b.	Indicator 2.6: Qualified teacher aides	1	2	3	4	5	____
c.	Indicator 4.3a: Accountability: intervention .	1	2	3	4	5	____
d.	Indicator 4.3b: Accountability: assistance . .	1	2	3	4	5	____

29b. [Where relevant] Why do you consider it inappropriate to collect data on some or all of the indicators listed in Question 25?

29c. [Where relevant] Why would it be extremely difficult to collect and report data on some or all of the indicators listed in Question 25?

30. Which THREE of the following agencies or organizations would you most likely contact to get assistance with respect to collecting data on any of the indicators listed in Question 25? (CIRCLE THREE)

a. U.S. Department of Education program contact . . . . 1 ____
b. U.S. Department of Education Regional Service Team . . . . 1 ____
c. Regional Educational Laboratories (SPECIFY NAME ________________) . 1 ____
d. Comprehensive Centers (SPECIFY NAME ____________________) . . . 1
e. Professional associations (e.g., CCSSO) 1
f. Institutions of higher education 1
g. Other states 1
h. Private non-governmental organizations or foundations 1
i. Other (SPECIFY)______________________________ . . 1
j. I wouldn't; I don't believe it is appropriate to collect such data 1

31. Does or will this office administer the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program?

a.	Yes	1 (SKIP to Q33)	
b.	No	2	
c.	Don't know	3 (SKIP to Q37)	____

32. What office administers the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program (CSRDP)? (NOTE: If you do not know, please say so and **GO TO QUESTION 37**)

Office/Division/Department: ______________________

Contact Person: ______________________

Telephone Number: ______________________

NOTE: Interviewer should contact the office/division/department administering the CSRDP and ask the following questions.

33. Please rate the difficulty of implementing each of the following new provisions for the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program in this state: (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ROW)

		Not at All Difficult	Minor Difficulty	Moderate Difficulty	Very Difficult	
a.	Developing a process and selection criteria for awarding competitive grants to LEAs	1	2	3	4	____
b.	Ensuring that only high-quality, well-defined, well-documented comprehensive school reform programs are funded	1	2	3	4	____
c.	Obtaining and disseminating materials identifying research-based comprehensive school reform models	1	2	3	4	____
d.	Providing technical assistance to local school districts and schools in evaluating, selecting, developing, and implementing comprehensive school reforms	1	2	3	4	____
e.	Planning for the evaluation of reform implementation and the measurement of student results	1	2	3	4	____
f.	Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	1	2	3	4	____

34. How helpful have each of the following sources of information been in informing your understanding of the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) program? (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ROW)

		Very Helpful	Helpful	A Little Helpful	Not at All Helpful	No Contact	
a.	Written information from U.S. Department of Education (ED) (e.g., guidance, other mailings)	1	2	3	4	5	____
b.	Other contacts with ED (e.g., conferences, workshops, on-line services, telephone)	1	2	3	4	5	____
c.	Regional Educational Laboratories	1	2	3	4	5	____
d.	Comprehensive Centers	1	2	3	4	5	____
e.	Eisenhower Math/Science Consortia	1	2	3	4	5	____
f.	Professional associations (e.g., CCSSO)	1	2	3	4	5	____
g.	Education periodicals/publications	1	2	3	4	5	____
h.	Institutions of higher education	1	2	3	4	5	____
i.	Other states	1	2	3	4	5	____
j.	Other private non-governmental organizations or foundations	1	2	3	4	5	____
k.	Other (SPECIFY) ____________________	1	2	3	4	5	____

35. How has your office informed local districts and schools about the CSRG? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	By forwarding copies of the U.S. Department of Education's guidance	1	____
b.	By sending out written information developed by the state (GET A COPY)	1	____
c.	By addressing the subject at statewide or regional meetings	1	____
d.	By providing technical assistance to districts in the process of preparing CSRDP applications	1	____
e.	By other means (SPECIFY) ______________________________ ______________________________	1	____

36. What kind of assistance, if any, has this office provided to districts that have received or are considering applying for subgrants under the CSRD? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Send written guidance developed by the state on selecting a research-based comprehensive school reform model	1	____
b.	Provide workshops on selecting a research-based comprehensive school reform model	1	____
c.	Host statewide showcases on selecting a research-based comprehensive school reform model	1	____
d.	Organize meetings with model developers, districts, and schools	1	____
e.	Address the subject at statewide or regional meetings	1	____
f.	Other (SPECIFY) ______________________________ ______________________________	1	____

37. Does this state have a special policy emphasis in reading?

a. Yes 1
b. No 2 (GO to Q39) ____

38. What is the role of Title I in supporting your state's special policy emphasis in reading? What are some examples?

39. Is Title I coordinated with special education at the state level to promote reading?

a. Yes (Please explain) ______________________________ 1
____
b. No 2 ____

Additional Items for the State Even Start Coordinator

1. How many local subgrant awards did this state make over the past 12 months? __________ ____

2. What was the total number of applications received for subgrant awards? __________ ____

3. From which of the following sources are data used to determine local need for an Even Start subgrant? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

   a. Applicant districts . . . . 1 ____
   b. Other SEA program offices (SPECIFY)______________________ 1 ____
   ____
   c. Other state agencies (SPECIFY)______________________ 1 ____
   ____
   d. Other (SPECIFY)______________________ 1 ____
   ____

4. In written communication--or in workshops, monitoring, or other interactions--what did you do to help districts fulfill their funding contribution requirement?

5. Do any of the following programs provide supplementary funding to local Even Start subgrant projects? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

   a. Title I . . . . 1 ____
   b. Head Start . . . . 1 ____
   c. Adult Education . . . . 1 ____
   d. Other (SPECIFY)______________________ 1 ____
   ____
   e. No . . . . 1 (SKIP to Q7) ____

6. [If supplementary funding is provided] Does this represent a change from what has been done in the past?

   a. Yes (EXPLAIN)______________________ 1
   ____
   b. No . . . . 2 ____

7. What factors have been major barriers to your efforts to collaborate with the following programs, agencies, and organizations? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

		Policies, Regulations, Laws	Time	Culture of Organization/ Differences in Program Philosophy	Differences in Goals and Objectives	Other	
a.	Title I	1	2	3	4	5	_____
b.	Adult Education	1	2	3	4	5	_____
c.	Head Start State Collaboration Grantees	1	2	3	4	5	_____
d.	State Welfare Office	1	2	3	4	5	_____
e.	State Department of Labor	1	2	3	4	5	_____
f.	Other programs within the state (SPECIFY)__________	1	2	3	4	5	_____
h.	Goals 2000	1	2	3	4	5	_____
i.	State Literacy Councils	1	2	3	4	5	_____
j.	State Library Councils	1	2	3	4	5	_____
k.	State Parents as Teachers Association	1	2	3	4	5	_____
l.	Other (SPECIFY)__________	1	2	3	4	5	_____

8. How does the state measure success in Even Start local programs?

a.	Number of families served	1	_____
b.	Number of project collaborators	1	_____
c.	Adult gains on measures of adult literacy or English proficiency	1	_____
d.	Number of adults receiving a GED	1	_____
e.	Adult gains in parenting knowledge or skills	1	_____
f.	Child gains on measures of school readiness	1	_____
g.	Child gains on measures of academic achievement	1	_____
h.	Other (SPECIFY) ______________________________	1	_____

9. Using the U.S. Department of Education definition of performance indicators as measures that show the degree to which key programs achieve desired performance levels, has this program developed performance indicators?

a.	Yes (OBTAIN A COPY)	1	_____
b.	No	2	_____
c.	Developing	3	_____

10. Has your program jointly developed performance indicators with other federal programs?

a.	Yes (SPECIFY PROGRAMS)	1	_____
b.	No	2	_____

11. If your program has developed program performance indicators, how do you and your colleagues in this program office use them? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a. To provide state and local administrators with a common language for defining program results .... 1 ____
b. To help program staff focus on program goals and objectives .... 1 ____
c. To provide program outcome data for administrative planning .... 1 ____
d. To enable this program to engage in cross-program coordination .... 1 ____
e. To monitor the progress of local programs or subgrantees .... 1 ____
f. To provide information about existing or potential problems .... 1 ____
g. To keep the state board of education or legislature informed about the program's progress .... 1 ____
h. To provide consumer-oriented information about program performance .... 1 ____
i. Other (SPECIFY) ____________________ 1 ____

12. In response to the requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act, the U.S Department of Education has developed a set of performance indicators for the **Even Start Family Literacy (Title I Part B)** program. Are you aware of the indicators?

a. Yes 1
b. No .... 2 **(STOP HERE)** ____

13. To assist in updating and improving the performance indicators, we are attempting to gauge the extent to which the following information is currently collected by your state. Please provide your best estimates as to the availability of the following information. (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH INDICATOR)

Indicator	**SEA Currently Collects Data?**				
	Yes, from ALL districts receiving program funds	Yes, from a sample of districts	No	Don't Know	Other
1.1: **Adult literacy achievement.** By fall 2001, 40 percent of Even Start adults will achieve significant learning gains on measures of math skills and 30 percent of adults will achieve such gains on measures of reading skills.	1	2	3	4	5
1.3: **Children's language development and reading readiness.** By fall 2001, 60 percent of Even Start children will attain significant gains on measures of language development and reading readiness.	1	2	3	4	5
1.4: **Parenting skills.** Increasing percentages of parents will show significant gains on measures of parenting skills, knowledge and expectations for their children.	1	2	3	4	5

14. [Where data are collected] What kinds of problems, if any, do you experience in collecting information in your state on the performance indicators listed in Question 13?

15. [Where data are collected] If your state collects data on any of the indicators (listed above), how is the information used? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

		Indicator 1.1	Indicator 1.3	Indicator 1.4	
a.	To identify districts and schools for which technical assistance is needed	1	2	3	____
b.	To report to state officials	1	2	3	____
c.	To report to federal officials	1	2	3	____
d.	To identify priorities for state-level technical assistance	1	2	3	____
e.	Other (SPECIFY) ______________________________	1	2	3	____

16. [Where data are collected] In which of the following ways, if any, does your state initiate corrective action against local school districts that fail to submit data to the state on the indicators for which data have been requested and/or required? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY) **[NOTE: ANSWER THIS QUESTION AND STOP]**

a.	It does not	1	____
b.	Assist local school districts in developing a plan to collect the data	1	____
c.	Withhold program funds	1	____
d.	Other (SPECIFY) ______________________________________	1	____

17a. [Where data are NOT collected] If you are not collecting data on any or all of the indicators listed in Question 13, how difficult would it be to start? Please indicate the extent to which data are available from districts for each of the indicators listed in Question 13. [NOTE: If you do not believe it would be appropriate to collect data on any or all of the indicators, circle "4" for "Not Appropriate") (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ROW)

		Could Collect from Districts and Report Fairly Easily	Possible to Collect from Districts & Report, But w/ Some Difficulty	Extremely Difficult to Collect & Report	Not Appropriate	Don't Know	
a.	Indicator 1.1: Adult literacy achievement	1	2	3	4	5	____
b.	Indicator 1.3: Children's language development & reading readiness	1	2	3	4	5	____
c.	Indicator 1.4: Parenting skills	1	2	3	4	5	____

17b. [Where relevant] Why do you consider it inappropriate to collect data on some or all of the indicators listed in Question 13?

17c. [Where relevant] Why would it be extremely difficult to collect and report data on some or all of the indicators listed in Question 13?

18. Which THREE of the following agencies or organizations would you most likely contact to get assistance with respect to collecting data on any of the indicators listed in Question 13? (CIRCLE THREE)

a.	U.S. Department of Education program contact	1	____
b.	U.S. Department of Education Regional Service Team	1	____
c.	Regional Educational Laboratories (SPECIFY NAME________________)	1	____
d.	Comprehensive Centers (SPECIFY NAME ______________________)	1	
e.	Professional associations (e.g., CCSSO)	1	
f.	Institutions of higher education	1	
g.	Other states	1	
h.	Private non-governmental organizations or foundations	1	
i.	Other (SPECIFY)____	1	
j.	I wouldn't; I don't believe it is appropriate to collect such data	1	

Additional Items for the State Director of Migrant Education

1. In your opinion, do the state's plans for assessing student mastery of state content standards address migratory students' unique needs?

   a. Yes (EXPLAIN)________________ 1
   b. No (EXPLAIN)________________ 2
   c. Don't know . . . . 3 ____

2. Approximately how many migrant students are included in your State assessments? (CIRCLE ONE)

   a. None 1
   b. Few 2
   c. Some 3
   d. Many/almost all 4
   e. Don't know . . . . 5 ____

3. Which of the following types of special accommodations are made (if any) to ensure that migrant students are included in State assessments? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

   a. Coordination between states to share assessment instruments . . . . 1 ____
   b. Appointment of state-level personnel to track students moving across state and district boundaries with respect to their assessment records . . . . 1 ____
   c. School-entry and exit assessments that measure students' mastery of content standards, language proficiency, and grade level or special program placement . . . . 1 ____
   d. Providing for the inclusion of limited English proficient students . . . . 1 ____
   e. Other (specify)________________ 1 ____
   f. No special accommodations are made . . . . 1 ____

4. To what extent is the curriculum used in migrant summer programs aligned with the standards of your state? (CIRCLE ONE)

   a. Not at all 1
   b. A little 2
   c. To some extent 3
   d. To a great extent 4
   e. Don't know . . . . 5 ____

5. To what extent is the curriculum used in migrant summer programs aligned with the standards of home-base states? (CIRCLE ONE)

   a. Not at all 1
   b. A little 2
   c. To some extent 3
   d. To a great extent 4
   e. Don't know . . . . 5 ____

6. How are academic and other records for migrant students who reside in your state being transferred when the students move across school district lines within the state? (Please CIRCLE the TWO most frequent ways that records are transferred across school district lines).

a.	Forwarded through an electronic database (e.g., a state or multi-state system)	1	____
b.	Given to the student or parent to hand-carry	1	____
c.	Mailed	1	
d.	Faxed	1	
e.	Other (SPECIFY)________________________	1	

Between states? (Please CIRCLE the TWO most frequent ways that records are transferred between states).

a.	Forwarded through an electronic database (e.g., a state or multi-state system)	1	____
b.	Given to the student or parent to hand-carry	1	____
c.	Mailed	1	
d.	Faxed	1	
e.	Other (SPECIFY)________________________	1	

7. What is your State doing to ensure that migrant students benefit from all available and appropriate programs and services other than the MEP?

8. Using the U.S. Department of Education definition of performance indicators as measures that show the degree to which key programs achieve desired performance levels, has this program developed performance indicators?

a.	Yes (OBTAIN A COPY)	1	
b.	No	2	
c.	Developing	3	____

9. Has your program jointly developed performance indicators with other federal programs?

a.	Yes (SPECIFY PROGRAMS)	1	
b.	No	2	____

10. If your program has developed program performance indicators, how do you and your colleagues in this program office use them? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	To provide state and local administrators with a common language for defining program results	1	____
b.	To help program staff focus on program goals and objectives	1	____
c.	To provide program outcome data for administrative planning	1	____
d.	To enable this program to engage in cross-program coordination	1	____
e.	To monitor the progress of local programs or subgrantees	1	____
f.	To provide information about existing or potential problems	1	____
g.	To keep the state board of education or legislature informed about the program's progress	1	____
h.	To provide consumer-oriented information about program performance	1	____
i.	Other (SPECIFY)________________________	1	____

11. In response to the requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act, the U.S. Department of Education has developed a set of performance indicators for the Education of Migratory Children (**Title I Part C**) program. Are you aware of the indicators?

a.	Yes	1	
b.	No	2 **(STOP HERE)**	____

12. To assist in updating and improving the performance indicators, we are attempting to gauge the extent to which the following information is currently collected by your state. Please provide your best estimates as to the availability of the following information. (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH INDICATOR)

Indicator	**SEA Currently Collects Data?**					
	Yes, from ALL districts receiving program funds	Yes, from a sample of districts	No	Don't Know	Other	
3.1: **Inter- and intrastate coordination.** SEAs and LEAs will demonstrate increased interstate and intrastate coordination to improve educational continuity for migrant students. Measures of coordination include joint products resulting from these formal agreements, meetings, or conferences to promote coordination; coordinated guidance to grantees; and joint planning by local staff from all available programs.	1	2	3	4	5	_
3.4: **Program coordination.** Federal, SEA, and LEA staff working with Title I, Part A and Part C, and other federally funded programs, will demonstrate increasing levels of substantive collaboration to meet the unmet needs of migrant children.	1	2	3	4	5	_

13. [Where data are collected] What kinds of problems, if any, do you experience in collecting information in your state on the performance indicators listed in Question 12?

14. [Where data are collected] If your state collects data on any of the indicators listed in Question 12, how is the information used? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

		Indicator 3.1	Indicator 3.4	
a.	To identify districts and schools for which technical assistance is needed	1	2	____
b.	To report to state officials	1	2	____
c.	To report to federal officials	1	2	____
d.	To identify priorities for state-level technical assistance	1	2	____
e.	Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	1	2	____

15. [Where data are collected] In which of the following ways, if any, does your state initiate corrective action against local school districts that fail to submit data to the state on the indicators for which data have been requested and/or required? **[NOTE: ANSWER THIS QUESTION AND STOP]**

a. It does not . . . . 1 ____
b. Assist local school districts in developing a plan to collect the data . . . . 1 ____
c. Withhold program funds . . . . 1 ____
d. Other (SPECIFY) ______________________________ . . 1 ____

16a. [Where data are NOT collected] If you are not collecting data on any or all of the indicators listed in Question 12, how difficult would it be to start? Please indicate the extent to which data are available from districts for each of the indicators listed in Question 12. [NOTE: If you do not believe it would be appropriate to collect data on any or all of the indicators, circle "4" for "Not Appropriate") (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ROW)

		Could Collect from Districts and Report Fairly Easily	Possible to Collect from Districts & Report, But w/ Some Difficulty	Extremely Difficult to Collect & Report	Not Appropriate	Don't Know	
a.	Indicator 3.1: Inter- and intrastate coordination	1	2	3	4	5	____
b.	Indicator 3.4: Program coordination	1	2	3	4	5	____

16b. [Where relevant] Why do you consider it inappropriate to collect data on some or all of the indicators listed in Question 12?

16c. [Where relevant] Why would it be extremely difficult to collect and report data on some or all of the indicators listed in Question 12?

17. Which THREE of the following agencies or organizations would you most likely contact to get assistance with respect to collecting data on any of the indicators listed in Question 12? (CIRCLE THREE)

a. U.S. Department of Education program contact . . . . 1 ____
b. U.S. Department of Education Regional Service Team . . . . 1 ____
c. Regional Educational Laboratories (SPECIFY NAME ________________) 1 ____
d. Comprehensive Centers (SPECIFY NAME ______________________) . . . 1
e. Professional associations (e.g., CCSSO) 1
f. Institutions of higher education 1
g. Other states 1
h. Private non-governmental organizations or foundations 1
i. Other (SPECIFY)______________________________ 1
j. I wouldn't; I don't believe it is appropriate to collect such data 1

Additional Items for the State Director of Title I, Part D, Subpart 2: Local Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk of Dropping Out

1. Does the SEA award Subpart 2 grants to local education agencies on a competitive basis or on the basis of some formula?

   a. Grants are awarded on a competitive basis 1
   b. Grants are awarded based on a formula (SPECIFY) ________________ 2 (SKIP to Q4)
   ____
   c. Other (SPECIFY) ________________________________ 3 (SKIP to Q4) ____

2. In the past 12 months, how many local subgrant awards did this state make under Subpart 2? ____________ ____

3. What was the total number of local applications received for subgrant awards? ________________ ____

4. What is the total amount of Subpart 2 funds allocated to local education agencies through subgrant awards? ____________

5. In 1997-98, what were the three leading selection factors for awarding grants to local education agencies? Among the following, CIRCLE the THREE factors which were given the most weight in selecting local education agencies for funding. (CIRCLE THREE RESPONSES ONLY)

   a. District's capacity to provide the services offered . . . . 1 ____
   b. District's prior experience in serving neglected, delinquent, or at-risk youth . . . 1 ____
   c. Quality of the proposed project . . . . 1 ____
   d. Number or percentage of neglected, delinquent, or at-risk youth residing in the district . . . . 1 ____
   e. Number or percentage of youth residing in locally operated correctional facilities . . . . 1 ____
   f. Severity of the unmet needs of neglected, delinquent, or at-risk youth . . . . 1 ____
   g. Number and/or quality of local programs serving neglected, delinquent, or at-risk youth . . . . 1 ____
   h. All applications were funded . . . . 1 ____
   i. Other (SPECIFY)______________________________ 1 ____

6. Using the U.S. Department of Education definition of performance indicators as measures that show the degree to which key programs achieve desired performance levels, has this program developed performance indicators?

   a. Yes (OBTAIN A COPY) 1
   b. No 2
   c. Developing . . . . 3 ____

7. Has your program jointly developed performance indicators with other federal programs?

a. Yes (SPECIFY PROGRAMS) 1
b. No . . . . 2 ____

8. If your program has developed program performance indicators, how do you and your colleagues in this program office use them? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a. To provide state and local administrators with a common language for defining program results . . . . 1 ____
b. To help program staff focus on program goals and objectives . . . . 1 ____
c. To provide program outcome data for administrative planning . . . . 1 ____
d. To enable this program to engage in cross-program coordination . . . . . 1 ____
e. To monitor the progress of local programs or subgrantees . . . . 1 ____
f. To provide information about existing or potential problems . . . . 1 ____
g. To keep the state board of education or legislature informed about the program's progress . . . . 1 ____
h. To provide consumer-oriented information about program performance . . . . . 1 ____
i. Other (SPECIFY) ______________________________ 1 ____

9. In response to the requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act, the U.S. Department of Education has developed a set of performance indicators for the **Title I Part D** program. Are you aware of the indicators?

a. Yes 1
b. No . . . . 2 **(STOP HERE)** ____

10. To assist in updating and improving the performance indicators, we are attempting to gauge the extent to which the following information is currently collected by your state. Please provide your best estimates as to the availability of the following information. (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH INDICATOR)

Indicator	SEA Currently Collects Data?				
	Yes, from ALL districts receiving program funds	Yes, from a sample of districts	No	Don't Know	Other
1.1: **Academic achievement.** The number of N, D, and at-risk children and youth who will progress toward a high school diploma or GED while institutionalized will increase.	1	2	3	4	5
2.1: **Institution-wide programs.** The number of institutions that will operate institution-wide programs integrating other federal and state programs to improve curriculum and instruction across the institution will increase.	1	2	3	4	5
2.2: **Innovative transition programs.** State and local programs will develop innovative strategies that help institutionalized students make a successful transition from an institution back to the community, either to further their education or to obtain employment.	1	2	3	4	5

11. [Where data are collected] What kinds of problems, if any, do you experience in collecting information in your state on the performance indicators listed in Question 10?

12. [Where data are collected] If your state collects data on any of the indicators listed in Question 10, how is the information used? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

		Indicator 1.1	Indicator 2.1	Indicator 2.2	
a.	To identify districts and schools for which technical assistance is needed	1	2	3	____
b.	To report to state officials	1	2	3	____
c.	To report to federal officials	1	2	3	____
d.	To identify priorities for state-level technical assistance	1	2	3	____
e.	Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	1	2	3	____

N or D/______________(State)

13 [Where data are collected] In which of the following ways, if any, does your state initiate corrective action against local school districts that fail to submit data to the state on the indicators for which data have been requested and/or required? **[NOTE: ANSWER THIS QUESTION AND STOP]**

a. It does not . . . . 1 ____
b. Assist local school districts in developing a plan to collect the data . . . . 1 ____
c. Withhold program funds . . . . 1 ____
d. Other (SPECIFY) ________________________________ . . 1 ____

14a. [Where data are NOT collected] If you are not collecting data on any or all of the indicators listed in Question 10, how difficult would it be to start? Please indicate the extent to which data are available from districts for each of the indicators listed in Question 10. [NOTE: If you do not believe it would be appropriate to collect data on any or all of the indicators, circle 4" for Not Appropriate) (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ROW)

		Could Collect from Districts and Report Fairly Easily	Possible to Collect from Districts & Report, But w/ Some Difficulty	Extremely Difficult to Collect & Report	Not Appropriate	Don't Know	
a.	Indicator 1.1: Academic achievement	1	2	3	4	5	____
b.	Indicator 2.1: Institution-wide programs	1	2	3	4	5	____
c.	Indicator 2.2: Innovative transition programs	1	2	3	4	5	____

14b. [Where relevant] Why do you consider it inappropriate to collect data on some or all of the indicators listed in Question 10?

14c. [Where relevant] Why would it be extremely difficult to collect and report data on some or all of the indicators listed in Question 10?

15. Which THREE of the following agencies or organizations would you most likely contact to get assistance with respect to collecting data on any of the indicators listed in Question 10? (CIRCLE THREE)

a. U.S. Department of Education program contact . . . . 1 ____
b. U.S. Department of Education Regional Service Team . . . . 1 ____
c. Regional Educational Laboratories (SPECIFY NAME ________________) 1 ____
d. Comprehensive Centers (SPECIFY NAME ______________________) . . . 1
e. Professional associations (e.g., CCSSO) 1
f. Institutions of higher education 1
g. Other states 1
h. Private non-governmental organizations or foundations 1
i. Other (SPECIFY)________________________________ 1
j. I wouldn't; I don't believe it is appropriate to collect such data 1

Additional Items for the State Coordinator of the Eisenhower Professional Development Program (Title II)

1. Using the U.S. Department of Education definition of performance indicators as measures that show the degree to which key programs achieve desired performance levels, has this program developed performance indicators?

a.	Yes (OBTAIN A COPY)	1	
b.	No	2	
c.	Developing	3	____

2. Has your program jointly developed performance indicators with other federal programs?

a.	Yes (SPECIFY PROGRAMS)	1	
b.	No	2	____

3. If your program has developed program performance indicators, how do you and your colleagues in this program office use them? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	To provide state and local administrators with a common language for defining program results	1	____
b.	To help program staff focus on program goals and objectives	1	____
c.	To provide program outcome data for administrative planning	1	____
d.	To enable this program to engage in cross-program coordination	1	____
e.	To monitor the progress of local programs or subgrantees	1	____
f.	To provide information about existing or potential problems	1	____
g.	To keep the state board of education or legislature informed about the program's progress	1	____
h.	To provide consumer-oriented information about program performance	1	____
i.	Other (SPECIFY) ______________________________	1	____

4. In response to the requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act, the U.S. Department of Education has developed a set of performance indicators for the **Eisenhower Professional Development Program--Title II**. Are you aware of the indicators?

a.	Yes	1	
b.	No	2 **(STOP HERE)**	____

5. To assist in updating and improving the performance indicators, we are attempting to gauge the extent to which the following information is currently collected by your state. Please provide your best estimates as to the availability of the following information. (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH INDICATOR)

Indicator	SEA Currently Collects Data?					
	Yes, from ALL districts receiving program funds	Yes, from a sample of districts	No	Don't Know	Other	
1.1: **Teachers' skills and classroom instruction.** By 1998, over 50% of a sample of teachers will show evidence that participation in Eisenhower-assisted professional development has resulted in improvement in their knowledge and skills, and by 1999 in an improvement in classroom instruction.	1	2	3	4	5	___
3.2: **Duration.** By 1998, 35% of teachers participating in district-level Eisenhower assisted activities will participate in activities that are a component of professional development that extends over the school year; by 2000, over 50% will.	1	2	3	4	5	___
4.1: **High-poverty schools.** The proportion of teachers participating in Eisenhower-assisted activities who teach in high-poverty schools will exceed the proportion of the national teacher pool who teach in high-poverty schools.	1	2	3	4	5	___

6. [Where data are collected] What kinds of problems, if any, do you experience in collecting information in your state on the performance indicators listed in Question 5?

7. [Where data are collected] If your state collects data on any of the indicators listed in Question 5, how is the information used? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

		Indicator 1.1	Indicator 3.2	Indicator 4.1	
a.	To identify districts and schools for which technical assistance is needed	1	2	3	___
b.	To report to state officials	1	2	3	___
c.	To report to federal officials	1	2	3	___
d.	To identify priorities for state-level technical assistance	1	2	3	___
e.	Other (SPECIFY) ____________	1	2	3	___

8. [Where data are collected] In which of the following ways, if any, does your state initiate corrective action against local school districts that fail to submit data to the state on the indicators for which data have been requested and/or required? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY) **[NOTE: ANSWER THIS QUESTION AND STOP]**

a. It does not . . . . 1 ____
b. Assist local school districts in developing a plan to collect the data . . . . 1 ____
c. Withhold program funds . . . . 1 ____
d. Other (SPECIFY) ________________________________ . . 1 ____

a. [Where data are NOT collected] If you are not collecting data on any or all of the indicators listed in Question 5, how difficult would it be to start? Please indicate the extent to which data are available from districts for each of the indicators listed in Question 5. [NOTE: If you do not believe it would be appropriate to collect data on any or all of the indicators, circle 4" for Not Appropriate) (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ROW)

		Could Collect from Districts and Report Fairly Easily	Possible to Collect from Districts & Report, But w/ Some Difficulty	Extremely Difficult to Collect & Report	Not Appropriate	Don't Know	
a.	Indicator 1.1: Teachers' skills and classroom instruction	1	2	3	4	5	____
b.	Indicator 3.2: Duration	1	2	3	4	5	____
c.	Indicator 4.1: High-poverty schools	1	2	3	4	5	____

9b. [Where relevant] Why do you consider it inappropriate to collect data on some or all of the indicators listed in Question 5?

9c. [Where relevant] Why would it be extremely difficult to collect and report data on some or all of the indicators listed in Question 5?

10. Which THREE of the following agencies or organizations would you most likely contact to get assistance with respect to collecting data on any of the indicators listed in Question 5? (CIRCLE THREE)

a. U.S. Department of Education program contact . . . . 1 ____
b. U.S. Department of Education Regional Service Team . . . . 1 ____
c. Regional Educational Laboratories (SPECIFY NAME ________________) 1 ____
d. Comprehensive Centers (SPECIFY NAME ______________________) . . . 1
e. Professional associations (e.g., CCSSO) 1
f. Institutions of higher education 1
g. Other states 1
h. Private non-governmental organizations or foundations 1
i. Other (SPECIFY)____ 1
j. I wouldn't; I don't believe it is appropriate to collect such data 1

Additional Items for the State Director of the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (TLCF)

1: How many local subgrant awards did this state make for fiscal year 1998? ____________ ____

2. What was the total number of local applications received for subgrant awards in fiscal year 1998? ______ ____

2a. What was the total amount of funds requested in the 1997-98 subgrant applications? ____________ ____

3. In 1997-98, what criteria did your state use to allocate local grants to high need and high poverty school districts? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	District's capacity to provide supporting resources (e.g., services, software and print resources) to ensure successful and effective use of technologies acquired under the program	1	____
b.	Quality of district's plans to coordinate the technology provided under TLCF with other grant funds available for technology purchases	1	____
c.	Extent to which other funds are available for technology purchases and use	1	____
d.	Appropriateness of the proposed technology purchases	1	____
e.	Extent to which district plan is of sufficient scope to improve student learning	1	____
f.	Extent to which district has developed a plan for integrating technologies acquired under TLCF into the school curriculum	1	____
g.	Extent to which district will involve parents, public libraries, business and community leaders in the development of an education technology plan	1	____
h.	Other (SPECIFY)____________________	1	____

4. What evidence, if any, does the state have that educational technology is associated with changes (either increases or decreases) in student performance in the core curriculum (e.g., reading/language arts, mathematics, science, social studies)? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Student performance data that links to information on classroom or school resources (SPECIFY Type and Source) ____________ ____________________	1	____
b.	Teacher survey data (Collected by state/district/school? ____________)	1	____
c.	Student survey data (Collected by state/district/school? ____________)	1	____
d.	District survey data (Collected by state? ____________)	1	____
e.	School site visits (Conducted by state/district? ____________)	1	____
f.	Analyses of requests for information/assistance from the field	1	____
g.	Website "hits"	1	____
h.	Informal conversations with local project staff	1	____
i.	Other (SPECIFY) ____________________	1	____
j.	None	1	____

5. What evidence, if any, does the state have that educational technology is actually being used for instruction? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Teacher survey data (Collected by state/district/school?________________)	1	____
b.	Student survey data (Collected by state/district/school?________________)	1	____
c.	District survey data (Collected by state? ________________)	1	____
d.	School site visits (Conducted by state/district?________________)	1	____
e.	Analyses of requests for information/assistance from the field	1	____
f.	Website "hits"	1	____
g.	Informal conversations with local project staff	1	____
h.	Other (SPECIFY) ________________________________	1	____
i.	None	1	____

6. Does the state monitor access to educational technology for: (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ROW)

		Yes	No	
a.	Students with disabilities	1	2	____
b.	Students with limited English proficiency	1	2	____
c.	Students in remote rural schools	1	2	____
d.	High poverty schools (i.e., 75% or more students eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch)	1	2	____
e.	Other (SPECIFY) ________________________________	1	2	____

7. Has the state used its TLCF funds to support professional development in educational technology?

a.	Yes (SPECIFY percent of TLCF funds used) ________________	1	
b.	No	2	____

8. In the past three years, has the state's emphasis on professional development in educational technology:

a.	Increased	1	
b.	Decreased	2	
c.	Remained about the same	3	____

9. Are teacher preparation programs at state colleges and universities required to provide training in the use of educational technology as a condition for receiving state accreditation?

a.	Yes	1	
b.	No	2	____

10. Is training in technology-related standards or competencies required for teachers in your state?

a.	Yes	1	
b.	No	2	____

11. Does your state assess student proficiency in the use of technology?

a. Yes 1
b. No .... 2 **(SKIP to Q13a)** ____

12. What types of student proficiencies in the use of technology are assessed and at what grade levels?

13a. Has your state provided technical assistance to districts that are preparing educational technology plans in order to qualify for the Federal Communication Commission's Universal Services education rate (E-rate)?

a. Yes 1
b. No .... 2 **(SKIP to Q14)** ____

13b. Were the technology plans reviewed by an independent panel?

a. Yes 1
b. No .... 2 ____

13c. On what basis were districts selected to receive technical assistance in preparing their educational technology plans? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a. Districts that request help .... 1 ____
b. High-poverty districts .... 1 ____
c. Districts with minimal technological capacity and/or expertise .... 1 ____
d. Other (SPECIFY) ______________________ 1 ____

14. In your estimation, to what extent has your program been able to meet local demand for technical assistance in the following areas? (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ROW)

		Great Extent	Some Extent	A Little	Not at All	NA	
a.	Preparing a educational technology plan	1	2	3	4	5	____
b.	Preparing an application for the E-rate	1	2	3	4	5	____
c.	Preparing teachers to use educational technology in the classroom	1	2	3	4	5	____
d.	Other (SPECIFY) ______________	1	2	3	4	5	____

15. Does your state provide districts and/or schools with information about effective models for using educational technology?

a. Yes (SPECIFY school, district, or both) ______________________ 1
b. No .... 2 ____

16. In your state, what among the following are barriers to using technology for instructional purposes? (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ROW)

		Major Barrier	Minor Barrier	Not a Barrier	Don't Know	
a.	Insufficient telephone lines in schools	1	2	3	4	____
b.	Insufficient equipment (e.g., number of computers)	1	2	3	4	____
c.	Lack of technical support or advice	1	2	3	4	____
d.	Lack of or inadequately trained staff	1	2	3	4	____
e.	Lack of teacher awareness regarding ways to integrate technology into the curriculum	1	2	3	4	____
f.	Lack of software that is integrated with the school curriculum	1	2	3	4	____
g.	Lack of software that is appropriate for special populations (e.g., students with disabilities, students with limited English proficiency, etc.)	1	2	3	4	____
h.	Other (SPECIFY) ____________________	1	2	3	4	____

17. Using the U.S. Department of Education definition of performance indicators as measures that show the degree to which key programs achieve desired performance levels, has this program developed performance indicators?

a. Yes (OBTAIN A COPY) 1
b. No 2
c. Developing . . . . 3 ____

18. Has your program jointly developed performance indicators with other federal programs?

a. Yes (SPECIFY PROGRAMS) 1
b. No . . . . 2 ____

19. If your program has developed program performance indicators, how do you and your colleagues in this program office use them? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a. To provide state and local administrators with a common language for defining program results . . . . 1 ____
b. To help program staff focus on program goals and objectives . . . . 1 ____
c. To provide program outcome data for administrative planning . . . . 1 ____
d. To enable this program to engage in cross-program coordination . . . . 1 ____
e. To monitor the progress of local programs or subgrantees . . . . 1 ____
f. To provide information about existing or potential problems . . . . 1 ____
g. To keep the state board of education or legislature informed about the program's progress . . . . 1 ____
h. To provide consumer-oriented information about program performance . . . . . 1 ____
i. Other (SPECIFY) ______________________________ 1 ____

20. In response to the requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act, the U.S. Department of Education has developed a set of performance indicators for the **Technology Literacy Challenge Fund** program. Are you aware of the indicators?

a. Yes 1
b. No . . . . 2 **(STOP HERE)** ____

21. To assist in updating and improving the performance indicators, we are attempting to gauge the extent to which the following information is currently collected by your state. Please provide your best estimates as to the availability of the following information. (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH INDICATOR)

	SEA Currently Collects Data?					
Indicator	Yes, from ALL districts receiving program funds	Yes, from a sample of districts	No	Don't Know	Other	
3.3: **Staff training.** Increasing proportions of practicing and prospective teachers, school administrators, and school librarians will receive professional development that enables them to effectively use education technology to help students learn.	1	2	3	4	5	____
4.2: **Access in high-poverty schools.** The access to education technology in high-poverty schools will be comparable to that in other schools.	1	2	3	4	5	____

22. [Where data are collected] What kinds of problems, if any, do you experience in collecting information in your state on the performance indicators listed in Question 21?

23. [Where data are collected] If your state collects data on any of the indicators listed in Question 21, how is the information used? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

		Indicator 3.3	Indicator 4.2	
a.	To identify districts and schools for which technical assistance is needed	1	2	____
b.	To report to state officials	1	2	____
c.	To report to federal officials	1	2	____
d.	To identify priorities for state-level technical assistance	1	2	____
e.	Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	1	2	____

24. [Where data are collected] In which of the following ways, if any, does your state initiate corrective action against local school districts that fail to submit data to the state on the indicators for which data have been requested and/or required? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY) **[NOTE: ANSWER THIS QUESTION AND STOP]**

a. It does not . . . . 1 ____
b. Assist local school districts in developing a plan to collect the data . . . . 1 ____
c. Withhold program funds . . . . 1 ____
d. Other (SPECIFY) ________________________________ . . 1 ____

25a. [Where data are NOT collected] If you are not collecting data on any or all of the indicators listed in Question 21, how difficult would it be to start? Please indicate the extent to which data are available from districts for each of the indicators listed in Question 21. [NOTE: If you do not believe it would be appropriate to collect data on any or all of the indicators, circle 4" for Not Appropriate) (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ROW)

		Could Collect from Districts and Report Fairly Easily	Possible to Collect from Districts & Report, But w/ Some Difficulty	Extremely Difficult to Collect & Report	Not Appropriate	Don't Know	
a.	Indicator 3.3: Staff training	1	2	3	4	5	____
b.	Indicator 4.2: Access in high-poverty schools	1	2	3	4	5	____

25b. [Where relevant] Why do you consider it inappropriate to collect data on some or all of the indicators listed in Question 21?

25c. [Where relevant] Why would it be extremely difficult to collect and report data on some or all of the indicators listed in Question 21?

26. Which THREE of the following agencies or organizations would you most likely contact to get assistance with respect to collecting data on any of the indicators listed in Question 21? (CIRCLE THREE)

a. U.S. Department of Education program contact . . . . 1 ____
b. U.S. Department of Education Regional Service Team . . . . 1 ____
c. Regional Educational Laboratories (SPECIFY NAME ________________) 1 ____
d. Comprehensive Centers (SPECIFY NAME ____________________) . . . 1
e. Professional associations (e.g., CCSSO) 1
f. Institutions of higher education 1
g. Other states 1
h. Private non-governmental organizations or foundations 1
i. Other (SPECIFY)________________________________ 1
j. I wouldn't; I don't believe it is appropriate to collect such data . . . . 1 ____

Additional Items for the State Coordinator of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Program

1. From which of the following sources are data used to determine which districts have the greatest need for these funds? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Applicant districts	1	____
b.	Our program office: the state Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program collects some/most/all of the district-level data needed (SPECIFY) ______________	1	____
c.	Other SEA program offices	1	____
d.	Other state agencies	1	____
e.	Other (SPECIFY) ______________________________	1	____

2. In your estimation, what are the benefits, if any, to concentrating 30 percent of available program funds in districts of greatest need?

3. In your opinion, what are the drawbacks, if any, to concentrating 30 percent of available program funds in districts of greatest need?

4. Using the U.S. Department of Education definition of performance indicators as measures that show the degree to which key programs achieve desired performance levels, has this program developed performance indicators?

a.	Yes (OBTAIN A COPY)	1	
b.	No	2	
c.	Developing	3	____

5. Has your program jointly developed performance indicators with other federal programs?

a.	Yes (SPECIFY PROGRAMS)	1	
b.	No	2	____

6. If your program has developed program performance indicators, how do you and your colleagues in this program office use them? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	To provide state and local administrators with a common language for defining program results	1	____
b.	To help program staff focus on program goals and objectives	1	____
c.	To provide program outcome data for administrative planning	1	____
d.	To enable this program to engage in cross-program coordination	1	____
e.	To monitor the progress of local programs or subgrantees	1	____
f.	To provide information about existing or potential problems	1	____
g.	To keep the state board of education or legislature informed about the program's progress	1	____
h.	To provide consumer-oriented information about program performance	1	____
i.	Other (SPECIFY) ______________________________	1	____

7. In response to the requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act, the U.S. Department of Education has developed a set of performance indicators for the **Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV)**. Are you aware of the indicators?

a. Yes 1
b. No . . . . 2 **(STOP HERE)** ____

8. To assist in updating and improving the performance indicators, we are attempting to gauge the extent to which the following information is currently collected by your state. Please provide your best estimates as to the availability of the following information. (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH INDICATOR)

Indicator	**SEA Currently Collects Data?**					
	Yes, from ALL districts receiving program funds	Yes, from a sample of districts	No	Don't Know	Other	
6.1: **Gun-Free Schools Act notifications and expulsions.** By 1998, all LEAs receiving ESEA funds will have policies requiring the expulsion of students who bring firearms to school and requiring notification of law enforcement.	1	2	3	4	5	____
8.3: **Approval of LEA applications.** All states will use performance indicators to make decisions regarding approval of LEA applications for funding. [LEAs are required to have performance indicators (called "measurable goals & objectives" in the statute) in their applications/plans]	1	2	3	4	5	____

9. [Where data are collected] What kinds of problems, if any, do you experience in collecting information in your state on the performance indicators listed in Question 8?

10. [Where data are collected] If your state collects data on any of the indicators listed in Question 8, how is the information used? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

		Indicator 6.1	Indicator 8.3	
a.	To identify districts and schools for which technical assistance is needed	1	2	____
b.	To report to state officials	1	2	____
c.	To report to federal officials	1	2	____
d.	To identify priorities for state-level technical assistance	1	2	____
e.	Other (SPECIFY) ______________________________	1	2	____

11. [Where data are collected] In which of the following ways, if any, does your state initiate corrective action against local school districts that fail to submit data to the state on the indicators for which data have been requested and/or required? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY) **[NOTE: ANSWER THIS QUESTION AND STOP]**

a. It does not .... 1 ____
b. Assist local school districts in developing a plan to collect the data .... 1 ____
c. Withhold program funds .... 1 ____
d. Other (SPECIFY) ______________________ .. 1 ____

12a. [Where data are NOT collected] If you are not collecting data on any or all of the indicators listed in Question 8, how difficult would it be to start? Please indicate the extent to which data are available from districts for each of the indicators listed in Question 8. [NOTE: If you do not believe it would be appropriate to collect data on any or all of the indicators, circle 4" for Not Appropriate) (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ROW)

		Could Collect from Districts and Report Fairly Easily	Possible to Collect from Districts & Report, But w/ Some Difficulty	Extremely Difficult to Collect & Report	Not Appropriate	Don't Know	
a.	Indicator 6.1: Gun Free Schools Act notifications and expulsions	1	2	3	4	5	____
b.	Indicator 8.3: Approval of LEA applications	1	2	3	4	5	____

12b. [Where relevant] Why do you consider it inappropriate to collect data on some or all of the indicators listed in Question 8?

12c. [Where relevant] Why would it be extremely difficult to collect and report data on some or all of the indicators listed in Question 8?

13. Which THREE of the following agencies or organizations would you most likely contact to get assistance with respect to collecting data on any of the indicators listed in Question 8? (CIRCLE THREE)

a. U.S. Department of Education program contact .... 1 ____
b. U.S. Department of Education Regional Service Team .... 1 ____
c. Regional Educational Laboratories (SPECIFY NAME ______________) 1 ____
d. Comprehensive Centers (SPECIFY NAME ______________) ... 1
e. Professional associations (e.g., CCSSO) 1
f. Institutions of higher education 1
g. Other states 1
h. Private non-governmental organizations or foundations 1
i. Other (SPECIFY)______________________ 1
j. I wouldn't; I don't believe it is appropriate to collect such data 1

Additional Items for State Title VI Coordinator

1. In adjusting your formula for children whose education imposes a higher than average cost per child, which of the following factors do you use? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

   a. Children living in areas with high concentrations of low-income families . . . . 1 ____
   b. Children from low-income families . . . . 1 ____
   c. Sparsely populated areas . . . . 1 ____
   d. Other (SPECIFY) ______________________________ 1 ____
   ____
   e. No adjustment made . . . . 1 ____

2. What data source(s) do you use when you adjust your formula?

3. Using the U.S. Department of Education definition of performance indicators as measures that show the degree to which key programs achieve desired performance levels, has this program developed performance indicators?

   a. Yes (OBTAIN A COPY) 1
   b. No 2
   c. Developing . . . . 3 ____

4. Has your program jointly developed performance indicators with other federal programs?

   a. Yes (SPECIFY PROGRAMS) 1
   b. No . . . . 2 ____

5. If your program has developed program performance indicators, how do you and your colleagues in this program office use them? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

   a. To provide state and local administrators with a common language for defining program results . . . . 1 ____
   b. To help program staff focus on program goals and objectives . . . . 1 ____
   c. To provide program outcome data for administrative planning . . . . 1 ____
   d. To enable this program to engage in cross-program coordination . . . . 1 ____
   e. To monitor the progress of local programs or subgrantees . . . . 1 ____
   f. To provide information about existing or potential problems . . . . 1 ____
   g. To keep the state board of education or legislature informed about the program's progress . . . . 1 ____
   h. To provide consumer-oriented information about program performance . . . . 1 ____
   i. Other (SPECIFY) ______________________________ 1 ____

6. In response to the requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act, the U.S. Department of Education has developed a set of performance indicators for the **Title VI (Innovative Education Program Strategies)** program. Are you aware of the indicators?

a. Yes 1
b. No .... **2 (STOP HERE)** ____

7. To assist in updating and improving the performance indicators, we are attempting to gauge the extent to which the following information is currently collected by your state. Please provide your best estimates as to the availability of the following information.

	SEA Currently Collects Data?					
Indicator	Yes, from ALL districts receiving program funds	Yes, from a sample of districts	No	Don't Know	Other	
1.1: **Reform efforts.** The use of Title VI funds will show evidence that the activities supported are integral to achieving district reform plans.	1	2	3	4	5	____

8. [Where data are collected] What kinds of problems, if any, do you experience in collecting information in your state on the performance indicator listed in Question 7?

9. [Where data are collected] If your state collects data on the indicator listed in Question 7, how is the information used? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

		Indicator 1.1	
a.	To identify districts and schools for which technical assistance is needed	1	____
b.	To report to state officials	1	____
c.	To report to federal officials	1	____
d.	To identify priorities for state-level technical assistance	1	____
e.	Other (SPECIFY) ________________________	1	____

10. [Where data are collected] In which of the following ways, if any, does your state initiate corrective action against local school districts that fail to submit data to the state on the indicator for which data have been requested and/or required? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY) **[NOTE: ANSWER THIS QUESTION AND STOP]**

a. It does not .... 1 ____
b. Assist local school districts in developing a plan to collect the data .... 1 ____
c. Withhold program funds .... 1 ____
d. Other (SPECIFY) ________________________ .. 1 ____

11a. [Where data are NOT collected] If you are not collecting data on the indicator listed in Question 7, how difficult would it be to start? Please indicate the extent to which data are available from districts for the indicator listed in Question 7 [NOTE: If you do not believe it would be appropriate to collect data on the indicator, circle 4" for Not Appropriate)

	Could Collect from Districts and Report Fairly Easily	Possible to Collect from Districts & Report, But w/ Some Difficulty	Extremely Difficult to Collect & Report	Not Appropriate	Don't Know	
a. Indicator 1.1: Reform efforts	1	2	3	4	5	____

11b. [Where relevant] Why do you consider it inappropriate to collect data the indicator listed in Question 7?

11c. [Where relevant] Why would it be extremely difficult to collect and report data on the indicator listed in Question 7?

12. Which THREE of the following agencies or organizations would you most likely contact to get assistance with respect to collecting data on the indicator listed in Question 7? (CIRCLE THREE)

a.	U.S. Department of Education program contact	1	____
b.	U.S. Department of Education Regional Service Team	1	____
c.	Regional Educational Laboratories (SPECIFY NAME ____________________)	1	____
d.	Comprehensive Centers (SPECIFY NAME ___________________________) . . .	1	
e.	Professional associations (e.g., CCSSO)	1	
f.	Institutions of higher education	1	
g.	Other states	1	
h.	Private non-governmental organizations or foundations	1	
i.	Other (SPECIFY)____	1	
j.	I wouldn't, I don't believe it is appropriate to collect such data	1	

Additional Items for the State Goals 2000 Coordinator

1. On what basis do districts award the 50 percent of funds that are to be made available to schools "with a special need for such assistance"? (CIRCLE ONE)

a.	Primarily poverty	1
b.	Primarily low achievement	2
c.	Primarily another basis (SPECIFY) ______________________________ ____	3
d.	Don't know	4

_____

2. What factors are considered and what targeting methods used in making ***local reform*** subgrant awards?

Factors Considered in Making Subgrant Awards	**Priority Given Each Factor [RANK, in order of priority, all that apply (e.g., 1, 2, 3, etc.)]**	**Primary Targeting Method** (select ONE of the following): 1: Weight applied during application review for purposes of making a funding decisions 2: Weight applied during application review for purposes of determining subgrant size 3: Targeting technical assistance to high-need LEAs and consortia of LEAs to assist them in preparing their applications 4: Pre-grant awards to high-need LEAs and consortia of LEAs to assist them in preparing their applications
a. Purpose or type of need being addressed (e.g., standards and/or assessment development)		
b. Consortia of LEAs		
c. LEAs/consortia with high percentages of low-income students		
d. LEAs/consortia with high percentages of low-achieving students		
e. Maintenance of rural/urban or regional balance among subgrantees		
f. Size or scope of project		
g. LEAs/consortia with community partnerships		
h. Quality of application/local plan		
i. Other (SPECIFY) _______________		

3. To what extent do each of the following change from year to year with respect to local reform subgrant awards? (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ROW)

		Great Extent	Some Extent	A Little	Not at All	
a.	Factors considered in making subgrant awards	1	2	3	4	____
b.	Priority assigned each factor considered in making subgrant awards	1	2	3	4	____
c.	Targeting method	1	2	3	4	____

4. What factors are considered and what targeting methods used in making ***preservice and professional development*** subgrant awards?

Factors Considered in Making Subgrant Awards	**Priority Given Each Factor [RANK, in order of priority, all that apply (e.g., 1, 2, 3, etc.)]**	**Primary Targeting Method** (select ONE of the following): 1: Weight applied during application review for purposes of making a funding decisions 2: Weight applied during application review for purposes of determining subgrant size 3: Targeting technical assistance to high-need LEAs and consortia of LEAs to assist them in preparing their applications 4: Pre-grant awards to high-need LEAs and consortia of LEAs to assist them in preparing their applications
a. Purpose or type of need being addressed (e.g., standards and/or assessment development)		
b. Consortia of LEAs		
c. LEAs/consortia with high percentages of low-income students		
d. LEAs/consortia with high percentages of low-achieving students		
e. Maintenance of rural/urban or regional balance among subgrantees		
f. Size or scope of project		
g. LEAs/consortia with community partnerships		
h. Quality of application/local plan		
i. Other (SPECIFY) ______________		

5. To what extent do each of the following change from year to year with respect to preservice and professional development subgrant awards? (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ROW)

		Great Extent	Some Extent	A Little	Not at All	
a.	Factors considered in making subgrant awards	1	2	3	4	____
b.	Priority assigned each factor considered in making subgrant awards	1	2	3	4	____
c.	Targeting method	1	2	3	4	____

6. In response to the requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act, the U.S. Department of Education has developed a set of performance indicators for the **Goals 2000** program. Are you aware of the indicators?

a. Yes 1

b. No . . . . 2 **(STOP HERE)** ____

7. To assist in updating and improving the performance indicators, we are attempting to gauge the extent to which the following information is currently collected by your state. Please provide your best estimates as to the availability of the following information. (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH INDICATOR)

	SEA Currently Collects Data?					
Indicator	Yes, from ALL districts receiving program funds	Yes, from a sample of districts	No	Don't Know	Other	
2.1: **Participation in reform efforts.** By 1999, as many as half of the state's school districts will actively participate in standards-based reform.	1	2	3	4	5	____
4.2: **Schools alignment of key processes.** Surveys of principals and teachers in states with standards will indicate that schools have aligned curriculum, instruction, professional development and assessment to meet challenging state or local standards.	1	2	3	4	5	____

8. [Where data are collected] What kinds of problems, if any, do you experience in collecting information in your state on the performance indicators listed in Question 7?

9. [Where data are collected] If your state collects data on any of the indicators listed in Question 7, how is the information used? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

		Indicator 2.1	Indicator 4.2	
a.	To identify districts and schools for which technical assistance is needed	1	2	____
b.	To report to state officials	1	2	____
c.	To report to federal officials	1	2	____
d.	To identify priorities for state-level technical assistance	1	2	____
e.	Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	1	2	____

10. [Where data are collected] In which of the following ways, if any, does your state initiate corrective action against local school districts that fail to submit data to the state on the indicators for which data have been requested and/or required? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY) **[NOTE: ANSWER THIS QUESTION AND STOP]**

a.	It does not	1	____
b.	Assist local school districts in developing a plan to collect the data	1	____
c.	Withhold program funds	1	____
d.	Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	1	____

11a. [Where data are NOT collected] If you are not collecting data on any or all of the indicators listed in Question 7, how difficult would it be to start? Please indicate the extent to which data are available from districts for each of the indicators listed in Question 7. [NOTE: If you do not believe it would be appropriate to collect data on any or all of the indicators, circle 4" for Not Appropriate) (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ROW)

		Could Collect from Districts and Report Fairly Easily	Possible to Collect from Districts & Report, But w/ Some Difficulty	Extremely Difficult to Collect & Report	Not Appropriate	Don't Know	
a.	Indicator 2.1: Participation in reform efforts	1	2	3	4	5	____
b.	Indicator 4.2: Schools alignment of key processes	1	2	3	4	5	____

11b. [Where relevant] Why do you consider it inappropriate to collect data on some or all of the indicators listed in Question 7?

11c. [Where relevant] Why would it be extremely difficult to collect and report data on some or all of the indicators listed in Question 7?

12. Which THREE of the following agencies or organizations would you most likely contact to get assistance with respect to collecting data on any of the indicators listed in Question 7? (CIRCLE THREE)

a. U.S. Department of Education program contact 1
b. U.S. Department of Education Regional Service Team 1
c. Regional Educational Laboratories (SPECIFY NAME ________________) 1
d. Comprehensive Centers (SPECIFY NAME ______________________) . . . 1
e. Professional associations (e.g., CCSSO) 1
f. Institutions of higher education 1
g. Other states 1
h. Private non-governmental organizations or foundations 1
i. Other (SPECIFY)____ 1
j. I wouldn't; I don't believe it is appropriate to collect such data 1

Additional Items for the State Coordinator of the Education Flexibility Partnership Demonstration Program or "Ed Flex"

[**NOTE:** The following set of questions (F1-F8) are applicable ***only*** to program administrators in states that are participating in the Education Flexibility Partnership Demonstration Program or Ed-Flex under the Goals 2000: Educate America Act]

F1. To what extent do you find that Ed-Flex authority has given your state more administrative flexibility than it had before your state was granted Ed-Flex status? (CIRCLE ONE)

a. To a considerable extent 1
b. Somewhat 2
c. Not at all . . . . 3 **(SKIP to F3)**
d. Don't know . . . . 4 **(SKIP to F3)** ____

F2. Please elaborate on the ways in which your state's flexibility has increased. How do you know this?

F3. How would you characterize the statewide use of the Ed-Flex waiver authority in your state? (CIRCLE ONE)

a. The states is underutilizing its capacity 1
b. The state is overutilizing its capacity 2
c. The state is using its Ed-Flex waiver authority at a reasonable level 3
d. Don't know . . . . 4 ____

F4. How would you characterize district-level use of the Ed-Flex waiver authority? (CIRCLE ONE)

a. The districts are underutilizing this opportunity 1
b. The districts are overutilizing this opportunity 2
c. The districts are using the Ed-Flex waiver authority at a reasonable level 3
d. Don't know . . . . 4 ____

F5a. Since your state received Ed-Flex status, how many districts in your state have received waivers? ______________ ____

F5b. How many districts have lost their waiver authority as a result of poor student performance? ______________ ____

F5c. [If respondent answered "0" to F5b] Does your state revoke district waivers due to poor student performance?

a. Yes 1
b. No 2
c. Don't know . . . . 3 ____

Ed-Flex/________________ (State)

F5d. What criteria, if any, does your state use for holding districts accountable for their waiver authority?

F6. Which of the following best describes the monitoring practices in your state regarding districts that have received waivers? (CIRCLE ONE)

a.	Districts with waivers are monitored more frequently	1	
b.	Districts with waivers are monitored less less frequently	2	
c.	Districts with waivers are monitored about as often as any other district	3	
d.	Other (SPECIFY) ______________________________	4	____

F7. To what extent, if at all, did the Ed-Flex waiver authority further state reform efforts?

a.	To a great extent	1	
b.	To some extent	2	
c.	A little	3	
d.	Not at all	4	
e.	Don't know; too early to tell	5	____

Please explain ____

____

F8. To what extent, if at all, did the Ed-Flex waiver authority improve the coordination of federal resources with state reform efforts?

a.	To a great extent	1	
b.	To some extent	2	
c.	A little	3	
d.	Not at all	4	
e.	Don't know; too early to tell	5	____

Please explain ____

____